AN

ADDRESS

TO THE

PROPRIETORS

OF

EAST INDIA STOCK,

IN CONSEQUENCE OF

The ERRORS and MISTAKES in ſome late Publications, relative to their SHIPPING.

LONDON,
Printed for J. NOURSE, Bookſeller to His MAJESTY.
MDCCLXXVIII.

ERRATA.

Page	Line	
11	2	*for the word* given *read* for.
15		*in the fourth column from* Horſenden *for* 80 *read* 78.
		in the fourth column from Sea-Horſe *for* 80 *read* 72.
		in the ſeventh column from Reſolution *the figure* 1 *to be eraſed.*
41	2	*for* only *read* by.
	8	*for* 48 *read* 34.
50	22	*for* releaſe *read* lighten.
54	12	*for* tons *read* ſhips.
81	19	*for* of *read* is.
84	15	*for* ſhip-huſband *read* ſhip-huſbands.
106	8	*after* defects *inſtead of a* period *a* comma.

TO THE

PROPRIETORS

OF

EAST INDIA STOCK.

A TREATISE was publiſhed in 1775, on the ſubject of the ſhipping employed in your ſervice; but as it contained ſome very conſiderable miſtakes, and many ungenerous reflections, it was treated with diſregard. Perhaps ſilence upon that occaſion may have been conſtrued into conviction, as another treatiſe of the ſame complexion has lately made its appearance.—Both ſeem to have much the ſame tendency; their aim being to degrade ſeveral of the members of a reſpectable body of men, by imputing their public conduct to the

moſt ſelfiſh and unjuſtifiable motives: alſo to explode a pamphlet publiſhed in 1775, entitled, Obſervations on *Eaſt India* Shipping: and to impel you to build your own ſhips in future. However, luckily for the parties, who have unfortunately become the objects of this writer's reſentment, the aſſertions contained in his treatiſes, and which furniſh the ground for his cenſure and reproof, are almoſt all of them found to be erroneous.

Whatever the merits, or demerits, of thoſe Obſervations are, to you they have been ſubmitted, and by your judgments they remain to be approved or condemned.

The two performances, before alluded to, are of ſo vindictive a turn, as to make them unworthy the leaſt notice; and which would probably have been their fate, had not an appeal to facts, given with ſuch an air of preſumptuous certainty, as may be likely to influence the uninformed, called for a reply. For who could imagine any perſon would venture to addreſs the public in an authoritative manner, unleſs he was convinced, and which it muſt be ſuppoſed this writer was in his own mind, the records of the Company would bear teſtimony to his aſſertions.

But for this appeal to records, the writer had been left unheeded, to the ſelf-approbation of his two treatiſes, abounding with harſh reflections and ungenerous inſinuations.

It may ſurely be preſumed, that the managing owners of the ſhips have at no period been ſo profligate, as this writer has endeavoured to repreſent; and that the ſuppoſed author of the Obſervations has in no ſituation behaved ſo unworthy of any truſt that may have been conferred upon him, as to deſerve the cruel ſuſpicion of aiming to miſlead thoſe who have confided in him. As truth ſeems to have been the object of the Obſervations, wherever the author has failed in the purſuit, or been deceived by her ſemblance, there can be no doubt but, on conviction of his error, he will as publicly retract his opinion, as he may before have given it. At the ſame time I ſhould be ſorry if mere poſitive aſſertions, haſty concluſions, or miſtaken interpretations, could induce him to recede. I would venture to ſay, he will bend with reverence and a willing ſubmiſſion to truth and reaſon, but never be borne down by empty declamation.

When men looſe their temper, and become petulant and imperious, whilſt they pretend to reaſon, it may fairly be concluded they have not the beſt ſide of the argument. Truth neither wants the ornaments of dreſs, nor the ſtorm of declamation, for her ſupport; they may ſerve to diſguiſe, but can contribute little towards her diſcovery. The ſimpleſt and the plaineſt attire beſt anſwers her purpoſes, and ſhews her to the moſt advantage.

This writer of Remarks makes, in both the publications, an appeal to facts: by his own facts then he ſhall be judged; and by them too let the Obſervations be left to ſtand or fall. The writer ſtyles himſelf a Member of the Committee of Twenty-four Proprietors, appointed in 1772 to examine into the Company's affairs; urging that reſpectable authority it may be ſuppoſed to gain the ſtronger credit to his aſſertions, and thereby the more effectually to diſcredit thoſe contained in the Obſervations. And then he proceeds to affirm, in his ſecond publication, that from the report of that committee it appears, the goods brought home in the ſpace of ſix years, from 1767 to 1772, amounted to 90,000 tons, and coſt the Company

in

in freight and demurrage 3,233,000l. which upon the average * came to 539,000l. *per annum*, or 35 l. 12 s. *per* ton. Whereas the Obſervations upon a calculation of ſeven years, from 1767 to 1773, made the average amount *per* ton only to 33 l. 1 s. including alſo therein the amount of the out-freight, and all the incidental charges of demurrage, &c.

On examining into the ſecret reports, and into the account in the freight office, the ſtatement given in the Obſervations of the expences for freight and demurrage during ſeven years, is found to be very right.

On a ſimilar examination of the expences incurred during the ſix years for freight and demurrage; the ſtatement given in the Remarks, is found to be very wrong, as the following repreſentations will ſhew.

* Average price in the Remarks for ſix years — — — —	£. 35	12	2½
Average price for ſeven years in the Obvations — — — —	33	1	1½
Difference	2	11	1

Aſſerted

Asserted amount, according to the Remarks, of the expence incurred in six years, for bringing home 90,000 tons of goods —	£.	3,235,554

Asserted quantity of goods brought home in six years, as by the Remarks — —	Tons	90,000

Asserted average amount for each year's freight and demurrage	£.	539,259

Asserted amount of the average price *per* ton for the freight, &c. according to the Remarks	£.	35	12	2½

Actual amount of the expence, according to the records, incurred in the six years for bringing home 88,853 tons of goods	£.	2,906,665
Error in the Remarks, as to the amount — —	£.	328,889
	£.	3,235,554

The number of tons actually brought home in the six years	Tons	88,853
Error in the Remarks, as to the quantity brought — —		1,147
	Tons	90,000

Real average amount for each of the six years freight, &c.	£.	484,444
Error in the Remarks, as to the annual amount, — —		54,815
	£.	539,259

Real average price according to the records of the Company	£.	32	14	3
Error in the Remarks, as to the price *per* ton — —		2	17	11½
	£.	35	12	2½

From the above ſtatement it appears, that this aſſertor of facts has miſtaken one account for another in the courſe of his reſearches. And by that means one of his boaſted facts becomes a palpable error in the explanation; which, with all his *ſcrutinous examination*, he was not able to diſcover. The truth is, that the ſeveral ſums ſet down by this Member of the Committee of Proprietors, are no more than the annual amounts paid under the head of freight and demurrage in your general caſh account, made up to the firſt day of *March* for each reſpective year, and can have no kind of reference to the exact ſum ariſing for the freight of the particular quantities of goods brought home in each ſeparate year. For this caſh account muſt always include the arrears due on the freights of any of the former years; and can only contain a part of the freight of the year the caſh account belongs to. So that inſtead of the goods brought home within the ſix years coſting the Company for freight and other incidental charges 3,235,554l. as aſſerted, the actual expence on that account amounted to no more than 2,906,665l. Inſtead of the quantity of goods brought home in that period amounting to 90,000

tons, they came to no more than 88,853 tons. And inſtead of the freight, &c. coming to 35 l. 12 s. 2½ d. *per* ton upon an average; the price was no more than 32l. 14s. 3d. Now the Obſervations this inveſtigator of accounts, this corrector of errors in others, has arraigned with ſo much acrimony, and with ſuch an air of contempt, ſtate, that the average coſt for bringing home the Company's goods during the ſpace of ſeven years, and which include the before mentioned ſix years, came to 33 l. 1 s. 1½ d. *per* ton. In this average price is blended the money paid upon the out-freights, by which means a few ſhillings more *per* ton are thrown into the account of the returning cargoes. Surely if the object of the Obſervations, as ſeems to be inſinuated, had been to make the coſt of the home-freights leſs than they really were, the author would hardly have carried the amount of the outward freights, ſmall as the ſum came to, into the general amount for the freight and demurrage paid on the returning cargoes.

Therefore, one of two concluſions may be fairly drawn from the ſtatement given by this Member of the Committee, either that he was very much bewildered and unequal to the taſk he had undertaken,

or

or elſe an endeavour to miſlead, which he has ſo ungenerouſly imputed to the Obſervations, may be retorted on himſelf.

" The Obſervations premiſe, upon the " ſubject of ſtowage, that ſhips when " meaſured have been found to vary conſi- " derably beyond the contracted tonnage; " and that even ſhips of the ſame mea- " ſured tonnage have been found to differ " often in the cubical contents of their " holds, owing to ſome particular cir- " cumſtances in the mold, or frame; that " the goods brought home from the dif- " ferent parts of *India*, and from *China*, " differ widely from each other as to " their compactneſs for ſtowage. And " that even cargoes from the ſame places " do ſome of them unavoidably fall out " more favourably for ſtowage than o- " thers." Add to theſe, that the perſons whoſe office it is to ſtow the goods, may not always be found alike experienced or attentive. Who, converſant in ſhipping, and eſpecially in *Indian* cargoes, will deny the truth of theſe aſſertions? or what is there in them that candour can conſider as falſe colourings? What are they more than warnings to judge with caution on this ſubject, by pointing out the difficulties in the way of deciding, to any great

nicety, on the capacity of ſhips of different ſizes, and in different ſituations. And therefore, general criterions only can be formed upon the ſubject. How is it poſſible fairly and candidly to give any other turn or interpretation to thoſe obſervations; beſides, does not the author deſire, *that no Proprietor or Owner will take his aſſertions upon truſt?* and, before he proceeds to eſtimate the tonnage to be brought upon ſhips of certain ſizes, has he not ſtated, the meaſures of the various aſſortments which compoſe the different cargoes, and the grounds whence his opinions had been formed? The reaſons too are aſſigned, in the Obſervations, for that difference, the author apprehends to prevail in ſhips of thoſe two dimenſions, with reſpect to their capacities for ſtowage; that the advantage of the large ſhip over the ſmall one lays in the additional room upon the lower deck, owing to her particular conſtruction, and not from any diſproportionate advantage in the hold of the large ſhip beyond the ſmall one. Add to theſe circumſtances, the large ſhips in general have not carried above 10 or 12 men hitherto more than the ſmall ſhips, whereby the room occupied by water, proviſions, and ſtores has been nearly alike

in

in both, and the amount of the tonnage given private trade, allowed to the ſmall and the large ſhips, has been in every reſpect the ſame.

The builders meaſured tonnage was taken as the ſtandard, in preference to the contract, by the author of the Obſervations, becauſe ſeveral of the freight ſhips, of the larger dimenſions in particular, had been found to vary from the original contract, even ſo much as 30 or 40 tons; and therefore the tonnage the ſhip was found to meaſure after ſhe was built, became the only true guide to decide on her capacity for ſtowage. For though a ſhip, in the raiſing of her frame, may without deſign fall out five or ſix tons; ſo great a difference as 30 or 40 tons beyond the contract cannot be the effect of mere accident.

And if there is little or nothing in this difference, which has been affirmed, why has there been any myſtery in the buſineſs? That ſteps were taken in order to conceal the truth, can if neceſſary, be proved; and then let candour and impartiality pronounce whether, in a matter which had been warmly agitated, wherein ſevere reflections had been thrown out againſt the conduct of individuals, and wherein juſtice and the

general intereſt called for the diſcovery, it does not appear very extraordinary to find, that any pains had been taken to prevent the real dimenſions being known. It was in conſequence of this difficulty to obtain the real meaſure, that a motion was made in the Committee of Shipping for every ſhip to be meaſured; and, ſenſible of the utility, an order was given by the Committee for that purpoſe. Theſe reaſons muſt ſurely become ſelf-evident to gentlemen converſant in ſhipping; and thoſe who are not, can never be conſidered as fit perſons to inveſtigate any ſuch buſineſs in a proper manner. The author of the Obſervations, even if he had erred, would certainly ſtand acquitted, after the various explanations he had given, from all ſuſpicion of diſguiſing the truth, with a premiditated deſign. For if that had been his object, he would never have been at ſuch pains to prevent any ſurprize upon the judgment, but would rather have endeavoured to involve and perplex the inveſtigation; and confined himſelf to arbitrary poſitive aſſertions.

Upon the preparatory grounds already mentioned, the author of the Obſervations has proceeded to deliver his ſentiments on the different capacities of ſhips of dif-

ferent dimenſions. And therein it appears to have been his opinion, that the *China* ſhips of the ſmaller ſizes, that is, from 680 to 720 tons of meaſured tonnage, will not bring to their reſpective amounts by 40 tons in net goods for the Company, and allow for 60 tons of private trade to be ſtowed likewiſe.

And that the ſhips under the deſcription of the larger ſizes, meaſuring from 780 to near 900 tons, with no more than 60 tons of private trade on board, would not exeeed the meaſured tonnage of the ſhip more than 20 tons in the quantity of goods that could be laden on the Company's account. And theſe eſtimates were framed upon a ſuppoſition of the cargoes conſiſting of the moſt favourable aſſortments of goods for ſtowage uſually laden; each cargoe to contain 1100 * cheſts of common boheas, and a conſiderable number of ſinglos.

In the publication which came out about three years ago, wherein the Obſervations were firſt attacked, the writer appears with an air of triumph to reprobate ſome of the opinions and aſſertions therein,

* The common boheas ſtowed againſt hyſons make a ſaving in point of room of 15 or 16 tons in every 100 tons.

and

and more particularly what relates to the capacity of the ſhips, as to ſtowage. For he pretends to bring teſtimony againſt the opinions contained in the Obſervations, from the cargoes of 14 ſhips from *China*, taken out of the records of the Company; theſe are the words, *I ſhall ſtate a few facts from the Company's records, and leave the Gentleman to conſider them at his leiſure.* Then proceeding to inform the public, that the following ſhips brought in the ſmaller ſizes from 20 to 54 tons, and in the larger ſizes from 110 to 113 tons of goods, more than the amount of the builder's tonnage of each ſhip. However, ſuch was his great diſcernment on the ſubject he has pretended to argue on, that every part of his aſſertion is erroneous, even on the ground of the contract tonnage. And the very ſame records to which he ſo poſitively appeals, ſhall be brought to condemn his own aſſertions; and to ſupport thoſe contained in the Obſervations, as the following ſtatement will ſhew.

When arrived.	Ships names.	Contract tonnage.	Goods aſſerted to have been laden	Goods really laden.	Diff. between the aſſerted and real quantity laden.	Builders meaſured tonnage.	Goods laden leſs than meaſured tonnage.	Goods laden more than builder's tonnage.
		Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons
1769	Groſvenor	679	705	625	80	700	75	
	D. Gloceſter	657	691	611	80	665	54	
	Lord Mansfield	632	669	589	80	646	57	
	Harcourt	676	710	630	80	689	59	
	True Britton	679	716	636	80	690	54	
	London	676	730	650	80	707	57	
	Horſenden	666	674	596	80	682	86	
	Seahorſe	676	680	608	80	692	84	
1770	Plaſſey	663	718	638	80	684	46	
	Ponſborne	676	688	667	21	684	17	
1771	Princeſs Royal	864	977	897	80	877		20
	Reſolution	804	915	835	80	836	1	1
	Bridgewater	804	914	834	80	840	6	
	Prime	864	997	917	80	882		35

The above ſtatement has been corrected from the Company's records, and ſeems fully ſufficient, to diſcredit the charges thus far brought againſt the Obſervations, and to enable the Proprietors to decide whether the author of the Obſervations has miſled the public, or the perſon who has laboured to inſinuate the Obſervations were wrote with a deſign to deceive.

The writer of the Remarks has given to every ſhip more goods conſiderably than were ever laden, according to the invoices; and, in order to carry ſtronger con-

conviction to the public, he has ventured to appeal to the records of the Company to confirm thoſe aſſertions, which, upon examination, they will be found to contradict.

Theſe Remarks maintain, that the ſhips of the ſmaller ſizes, 10 in number, brought for the Company from 20 to 54 tons of goods beyond the builder's tonnage on each ſhip; whereas, in truth, not one of them will be found to have brought even to the amount of the contract tonnage; though that ſtandard having been exploded in the Obſervations, as a rule for meaſurement, cannot, with any degree of juſtice, be uſed to diſcredit the aſſertions they contain. Of the above 10 ſhips but one brought home goods for the Company to the amount of the builder's meaſured tonnage by 40 tons; which was the *Pouſborne*, in the year 1770, that ſhip took on board within 17 tons of the meaſured tonnage; but then ſhe had an advantage from the cargo, conſiſting of 400 cheſts of common boheas, more than the average amount for each ſhip, according to the eſtimate given in the Obſervations, which makes a difference in favour of the ſtowage of 20 tons; ſo that had thoſe 400 cheſts

been

been exchanged for hyſons, the ſhip would have been 37 tons ſhort of her meaſured tonnage, and within three tons of the ſtandard given in the Obſervations. Beſides this circumſtance, there appears to have been no more than 27 tons of private trade laden of thoſe aſſortments, which occupy ſufficient room to be brought into the compariſon; for the remainder of the private trade conſiſted of tutenauge, the ſame in all reſpects as iron ballaſt; for it lay in thoſe ſpaces which otherwiſe had been filled with pebble-ſtones: ſo that if 33 tons of the tutenauge had been exchanged for rhubarb, caſſia, China ware, or any other articles of thoſe kinds, the commander and officers are permitted to lade, the net goods put on board for the Company muſt have been even within the contract tonnage of the ſhip, at leaſt 40 or 50 tons. As to the four large ſhips quoted in the firſt publication, among the 14, and which had been carefully culled out by this writer of Remarks, from the Company's records; ſo far were thoſe ſhips from bringing, as he has aſſerted, from 110 to 113 tons more than the builder's tonnage, not one of them brought to half that amount beyond the contract tonnage: the *Prime* brought 35 tons more than the builder's

meaſured tonnage, and conſequently exceeded the ſtandard laid down in the Obſervations for large ſhips 15 tons; but then it appears the full indulgence in private trade was not laden by 26 tons; and the cargo at the ſame time conſiſted of common boheas and ſinglos, 800 quartern-chefts of other ſorts only excepted. The *Princeſs Royal* brought but 20 tons more than the builder's tonnage, which was no more than equal to the eſtimated amount given in the Obſervations; though her cargo contained a conſiderable quantity of ſinglos, and 250 chefts extraordinary of common boheas; as to the other two large ſhips, the *Reſolution* had one ton, and the *Bridgewater* ſix tons leſs than their builder's meaſured tonnage in goods laden on the Company's account: yet has this writer affirmed thoſe four ſhips brought from 110 to 113 tons, beyond their builder's tonnage, according to the Company's records. Men in uſing ſuch authentic teſtimony, ſhould be very cautious of committing miſtakes, leſt they incur the cenſure of miſuſing ſuch reſpectable authority. This writer, however, after three years reflection on his former aſſertions, has not, in all that time, been able to diſcover the errors he had

had fallen into; for in his late publication the charge is renewed againſt the Obſervations on the ſubject of the China cargoes; and in order to diſcredit the Obſervations on that head, the writer comes forward again with ſeven cargoes from China, three of them laden on the larger ſized, and four on the ſmaller ſized ſhips.

After exhibiting very inaccurate ſtatements of ſome of the cargoes, he ſays, *Is this author really ſo ignorant, with all his boaſted practical experience, as not to know of any of thoſe facts, or did he chuſe to wink at them?* The following liſt contains the ſhips names, their meaſured tonnage, his *facts*, and the quantity of goods laden on each ſhips.

When arrived.	Ships Names.	Ships contract Tonnage.	Ships meaſured Tonnage.	Goods aſſerted to have been brought.	Goods laden by the Invoice.	
		Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	
					623	goods in Packages.
1765	Britiſh King	663	685	717	50	of Tutenauge.
1765	Cruttenden	666	678	674	673	Smaller Sizes.
1770	Glatton	676	712	700	620	
1771	Royal Capt.	676	699	697	632	
1771	Prime	864	882	917	917	Larger Sizes.
1773	Royal Henry	804	842	869	869	
1777	Royal Henry	804	842	860	860	

Theſe cargoes have been brought forward, in this ſecond publication, with a view ſtill farther to explode thoſe opinions laid down in the Obſervations, "That "the ſmaller ſized ſhips will not in ge- "neral bring from China, goods for the "Company, to the amount of the mea- "ſured-tonnage by 40 tons; and that the "larger ſized ſhips will not exceed the "builder's meaſured tonnage more than "20 tons." To the *Britiſh King** this writer has allotted a cargo of 717 tons of goods, although, according to her invoice, no more than 673 tons were laden, and out of that 50 tons were tutenauge; in every reſpect the ſame as iron ballaſt: ſo that in truth the *Britiſh King* had no more than 623 tons in goods of thoſe aſſortments, which can in fairneſs be taken into any compariſon that ſhall be made to diſcredit the opinions given in the Obſervations, relative to the ſtowage of the Company's goods from *China*.—Now ſtating the 623 tons againſt the meaſured tonnage of the *Britiſh King*, amounting to 685 tons:—

* Aſſerted to have been laden, - -	tons,	717
Laden, including tutenauge, - -		673
Difference,	tons,	44

Inſtead

Inſtead of the ſhip exceeding the builder's tonnage in goods for the Company, the cargo will be found to be 62 tons leſs than that amount; and 12 tons under the meaſured tonnage, reckoning even the tutenauge into the account The *Glaſton*, aſſerted to have brought 700 tons of goods, had no more than 620* tons for the Company; ſo that her cargo was under the builder's meaſured tonnage 92 tons —The *Royal Captain*, aſſerted to have brought 697 tons, had no more laden for the Company than 632† tons; and conſequently her cargo was 67 tons under the builder's meaſured tonnage. The *Cruttenden*, the other ſmall ſhip, brought within five tons of the builder's meaſured tonnage in net goods for the Company; but then there were not laden in private more than 48 tons, which made the private trade on board 12 tons ſhort of the allowance, beſides, ſeven tons out of the 48 conſiſted of dunnage and lazaretto ſtores; therefore if 15 or 16 tons more had been laden in ſuch bulky articles as the commanders are allowed to trade in:

* Eighty tons of goods were aſſerted to have been laden beyond the invoice amount.

† Sixty-five tons of goods were aſſerted to have been laden more than the invoice amount.

even

even this ſhip would not have exceeded the ſtandard in the Obſervations above 20 tons the outſide; but putting the private trade out of the queſtion, the *Cruttenden* will then be the only ſhip out of the 14 ſmaller ſized ſhips culled from the records of the Company by this Member of the Committee of Proprietors, in his two publications, whoſe cargo proved ſo very advantageous for ſtowage, as to have exceeded to the amount of about 30 tons, the general ſtandard which had been laid down in the Obſervations. As to the cargoes of the great ſhips, the *Prime*'s has been already conſidered, being one of the 14 ſhips mentioned in the firſt publication; and exceeded the ſtandard laid down in the Obſervations 15 tons only: the *Royal Henry*'s cargo in 1773 was ſeven tons over, and in 1777, two tons under the ſtandard; but then it is to be obſerved, the common boheas laden on both voyages were conſiderably more than 1100 cheſts, and will account for a much greater exceſs than aroſe upon the cargo brought home in 1773.

With reſpect to the ſhips of the ſmaller ſizes, if this writer of Remarks had examined with more accuracy and attention, he might have diſcovered that the *Royal Captain* brought from *China*, in the year 1766,

1766, the greateſt quantity of thoſe ſorts of goods which can be admitted into the compariſon with any degree of propriety; yet, even then, the cargo did not amount to more than 656 tons, and was ſtill 43 tons ſhort of the builder's meaſured tonnage. But how the firſt voyage of that ſhip eſcaped his ſearch, is difficult to conceive; for as he indiſcriminately loads with tutenauge, or tea, he could never have applied tutenauge better for his purpoſe, as it would have made the *Royal Captain*'s cargo in 1762 amount to 698 tons, there having been laden in *China* that voyage 59 tons of tutenauge on the Company's account. There is another of the ſmaller fized ſhips, whoſe cargo upon the general face of it, would have anſwered his purpoſe better than any he has ſelected: the ſhip alluded to is the *Hampſhire*, which in 1767 brought home for the Company 717 tons, the contract tonnage of the ſhip was 699; the meaſured tonnage when built was found to be 711 tons; ſo* that this ſhip had 46 tons of

P

* Exceſs laden beyond the eſtimated in the Obſervations - - -	tons	46
Deduct gained by 550 cheſts of common bohea extra in the ſtowage, - -		28
Exceſs only - - - -	tons	18

goods

goods more than the eſtimated amount to be brought in the ſmaller ſhips according to the Obſervations, but when the difference ſhall be taken off for 550 cheſts of common boheas, laden on that ſhip beyond the proportional amount of 1100 cheſts, as ſtated in the Obſervations, the *Hampſhire*'s ſtowage will then be brought to no more than 18 tons beyond the ſtandard in the Obſervations; and will bring the cargoe 22 tons under the ſhip's meaſured tonnage. It is to be hoped theſe explanations will be found ſufficient to ſupport the Obſervations, in what relates to the *China* cargoes, from the charge of being wrote with an intent to diſguiſe the truth, and to miſlead your judgments.

No man could ever think of giving his ſentiments upon a ſubject where ſuch various circumſtances ariſe to affect the ſtowage, on any other than a general ground.

And a fair attention to the explanations, and the chain of reaſoning ſtated in the Obſervations, might have convinced this commentator no other had been attempted. However, out of the great number of returning ſhips from *China*, between the years 1761 to 1777, no more than

three of the ſmaller ſized ſhips have exceeded, on a fair compariſon, the eſtimated ſtandard laid down in the Obſervations; theſe were the *Cruttenden* in 1763, about 30 tons the outſide; the *Hampſhire* in 1767, 18 tons; and the *Ponſborne* in 1765, to the amount of only three tons. As for the reſt, many are under the eſtimate, and ſome to a conſiderable amount. And of the larger ſized ſhips, only one has gone beyond the ſtandard given in the Obſervations, and that but 15 tons.

It may reaſonably be ſuppoſed, that the writer of theſe Remarks, at the time of his laſt publication, was not totally unacquainted with the great difference that ſubſiſted between the contract and meaſured tonnage in ſome of the ſhips, and which in that caſe, might ſurely have convinced him, that the contract tonnage was but a vague criterion to decide from, on the dimenſions of the ſhips. At leaſt it muſt have been evident, that the meaſured tonnage taken for the rule to judge of the ſize of every ſhip, would become a ſafer guide, and leſs liable to miſlead, than the contract, as the one ſhews what the real dimenſions are found to be after the ſhip is built, the other only what

they were intended to be, when the ſhip was contracted for. Let the difference be much or little, the principle can never, in the eye of reaſon, be denied. Ungenerous reflections by no means dignify, or contribute to enforce an argument; and every man ſhould be well aſſured of his facts, before he brings them forward; eſpecially with an air of triumph over the ſuppoſed errors of other men.

The better to vindicate the Obſervations, and to ſecure them from any unfavourable conſtruction in your opinions; charged as they have been, with drawing haſty and unfair concluſions, and aiming to prevent or conceal the truth; the following ſtatements, therefore, of the burthens of five *Swediſh* ſhips, and the tonnage of 11 cargoes, brought by thoſe five ſhips between the years 1768 and 1778, all of which were obtained from the beſt authority, are ſubmitted to your conſideration, for the purpoſe of enabling you to judge by that means, of the capacity of your own ſhips to bring from *China*, in general, more goods than have been allotted in the Obſervations; and to form ſome judgment likewiſe, whether the ſtowage can be extended as much further, as ſome

perſons have imagined. Theſe ſhips will contribute to confirm, if doubts ſtill remain, ſeveral opinions contained in the Obſervations, concerning the *China* ſtowage. They will ſhew that ſuch a difference ſubſiſts among the ſeveral ſorts of goods, as is therein laid down; and that the ſtowage becomes materially affected, according as the aſſortments, in the cargoe, fall out more or leſs advantageous for that end.

They will alſo explode the opinion, that a ſhip of 1100 tons burthen, will bring from *China* 350 tons of goods beyond the builder's meaſured tonnage.

The ſhips ſent from *Sweden* to *China*, are navigated for a ſeries of years by the ſame perſons, are conſtantly employed in the ſame track, and are conſidered as ſome of the fineſt merchant ſhips in the world. They ſail better than our merchant ſhips in general. No private trade is allowed to be laden on them, and many gentlemen, who have frequented *China*, can bear teſtimony to the care and attention paid to the ſtowage of the *Swediſh* cargoes. In order to prevent the breakage in the wings and elſewhere, which large packages unavoidably occaſion, from remaining unoccupied, ſmall rolls and tubs

of *China*, to the amount of ſeveral tons, not admitted into the *Engliſh* Company's packages, are prepared by the *Swediſh* Company to be put away in thoſe vacancies, which elſe muſt be filled with ballaſt or dunneage.

Now rejecting from theſe *Swediſh* cargoes, the ſmaller packages of China ware, as the *Engliſh* cargoes have none ſimilar, but taking into the account, all the cheſts of China, teas, nankeens, ſilks, drugs, &c. and then, after bringing them into the *Engliſh* freight tons, and comparing the amount with the meaſured tonnage of the ſhip, there cannot be found a truer criterion to form a general idea, as to the capacity of a ſhip of a 1100 tons, than the cargoes of theſe *Swediſh* ſhips will furniſh.

The

The *Adolphi Frederick*, burthen 1,167 tons, brought home from *China* to *Gottenburgh*, in the year 1768, the following goods. Tons 1,167

Chefts	*Swediſh* lb.		*Engl.* lb.		
2,880 of tea, containing	1,034,502,	common bohea			
Black teas of other ſorts	391,178				
	1,425,680,	equal	1,325,882		
Singlos and greens	29,504,	equal	27,438		
				Engl. lb.	
				1,353,320	Freight tons.
Swed. lb.	1,455,184	in canniſters *Engl.* lb.		8,835	1,222

Freight tons.

305 chefts of China	83	
Silks and nankeens	5	
Drugs of all ſorts	18	
		106
		1,328

There were ſundry ſlabs of tutenauge, the ſame as ballaſt, and bundles and tubs of China ware ſtowed in the limbers and breakages, and ſome ſago ſtarted among the China.

Deduct for private trade	60
After deducting for private trade, the cargo brought in freight tons, with 2,880 chefts of bohea, amouted to	1,268
And exceeded the builder's tonnage	Tons 101

The *Adolphi Frederick* brought in 1770, as follows.

				Tons.
Chefts	*Swediſh* lb.			Burthen 1,167
1,500, containing	546,788, of common bohea			
Congos and ſouchon	771,699			
		Engl. lb.		
Swediſh lb.	1,318,487, equal to	1,226,192		
Singlos, &c.	30,202, equal to	28,087	*Engl.* lb.	
			1,254,279	
		Beſides canniſters *Engliſh* lb.	8,150	Freight tons.
				1,133
			Freight tons	
429 Chefts of China ware			69	
Silks and nankeens			9	
Drugs of ſorts			28	
				106
				1,239
Beſides ſundry rowls and tubs of China for the limbers, wings, and other breakages				
Deduct for private trade				60
				1,179
The freight tons brought, deducting for private trade, were over the meaſured tonnage				Tons 12

100 *Swediſh* lb. make 93 lb. *Engliſh*.

The *Adolphi Frederick* brought in 1777 from *China* as follows.

Chefts.	*Swediſh* lb.				Tons.
				Burthen	1,167
1,225, containing	442,473	of common boheas			
Laden alſo	797,848	of congos, &c.			
			Eugl. lb		
Swediſh lb.	1,240,321,	or *Engl.* lb.	1,153,498		
Singlos, &c.	58,938,	or *Engl.* lb.	54,813		
				Engl. lb.	
				1,208,311	
Swediſh lb.	1,299,259,	beſides tea in canniſters		840	Freight tons.
					1,092
282 Chefts of China	—	—	—	78	
Silks and nankeens	—	—	—	5	
Drugs of ſorts	—	—	—	18	
					101
Beſides rowls and tubs of China for the limbers, wings, &c. and 3,000 lb. of ſago ſtarted in the China chefts					
Deduct for private trade	—	—	—		60
					1,133
The cargoe brought in freight tons, after deducting for private trade, was under builder's meaſured tonnage	—	—	—	Tons	34

The *Prince Guſtaff* brought in 1771, as follows.

	Swediſh lb.		B. meaſ. tonn.
Cheſts.			1,145
2,500, containing	898,996 of common boheas.		
Laden alſo	429,131 of congos, &c.		
		Engl. lb.	
Swediſh lb.	1,328,127, or *Engl.* lb.	1,235,158	
Singlos, &c.	44,600, or *Engl.* lb.	41,478	
		Engl. lb.	
		1,276,636	
Swediſh lb.	1,372,727, beſides tea in canniſters	879	Freight tons.
			1,150

	Freight tons.	
238 Cheſts of China ware	65	
Silk and nankeens	2½	
Drugs of ſorts	21½	
		89
	Tons	1,239
Beſides rowls and tubs of China to ſtow in breakages, and about 2,000 lb. of ſago ſtarted among the China ware		
Deduct for private trade		60
		1,179
After deducting for private trade, the cargo brought into freight tons, only exceeded the meaſured tonnage	Tons	34

[32]

The *Prince Guſtaff* brought, in 1775, as follows

Cheſts.	*Swediſh* lb.				Tons.
				Burthen	1,145
1,800, containing	656,305, of common bohea.				
Laden alſo	593,131, of congos, &c.				
			Engl. lb.		
Swediſh lb.	1,249,356, or *Engl.* lb.		1,161,901		
Singlos, &c. greens	71,624, or *Engl.* lb.		66,610	*Engl.* lb.	
				1,228,511	
Swediſh lb.	1,320,980, beſides tea in canniſters			840	Freight tons.
					1,112

		Freight tons.		
253	Cheſts of China ware — — — — —	69		
	Silk and nankeens — — — — — —	3		
	Drugs of ſorts — — — — — —	16		
			88	
		Tons	1,200	

Beſides rowls and tubs, and China to be ſtowed in breakages, and about 3,000 lb. of ſago ſtarted among the China ware.

Deduct for private trade — — — — — — —	60	
	1,140	
After deducting for private trade, the cargoe brought into freight tons, was under the meaſured tonnage — — — — — Tons	5	

The *Finland* brought, in 1774, from *China*, as follows.

	Swediſh lb.		*Engl.* lb.		Tons.
Cheſts.				Burthen	1,115
1,800, containing	654,631, of common bohea.				
Congos, &c.	639,782				
Swediſh lb.	1,294,413,	or *Engl.* lb.	1,203,804		
Singlos, &c. greens	77,354,	or *Engl.* lb.	71,939		
				Engl. lb.	
				1,275,743	
Swediſh lb.	1,371,767,	beſides tea in canniſters		947	Freight tons.
					1,156

	Freight tons.	
288 Cheſts of China ware	78	
Silks and nankeens	11	
Drugs of ſorts	17	
		106
	Tons	1,263

Beſides rowls and tubs of China ware for breakages, and 3,400 lb. of ſago ſtarted.

Deduct for private trade	60
	1,203
The cargo brought into freight tons, after deducting for private trade, exceeded	Tons 88

The *Finland* brought, in 1777, from *China*, as follows.

Chefts.	*Swediſh* lb.		*Engl.* lb.		Tons.
				Burthen	1,115
1,225, containing	438,320,	of common bohea.			
	830,304,	of congo, &c.			
Swediſh lb.	1,268,624,	or *Engl.* lb.	1,179,826		
Singlos, &c. greens	48,215,	or *Engl.* lb.	44,840		
				Engl. lb.	
				1,224,660	
Swediſh lb.	1,316,839,	beſides tea in canniſters		850	Freight tons.
					1,104
				Freight tons.	
297 Chefts of China ware				81	
Silks and nankeens				5	
Drugs of ſorts				7	
					93
				Tons	1,197
Beſides rowls and tubs of China ware, and ſome tutenauge for ballaſt.					
Deduct for private trade					60
					1,137
Exceeded only				Tons	22

1 35 1

22 2

The *Sophia Magdelena* brought, in 1775, from *China*, as follows.

Cheſts.	*Swediſh* lb.			Tons.
1,800, containing	648,944, of common bohea.			Burthen 1,121
Laden alſo	646,295, of congo, &c.			
		Engl. lb.		
Swediſh lb.	1,295,239, or *Engl.* lb.	1,204,572		
Singlos, &c. greens	46,771, or *Engl.* lb	43,497		
			Engl. lb. 1,248,069	
Swediſh lb.	1,342,010, beſides tea in canniſters		800	Freight tons. 1,125

	Freight tons.	
292 Cheſts of China ware — — — —	80	
Silks and nankeens — — — — — —	3	
Drugs of ſorts — — — — — —	17	
		108
	Tons	1,233

Beſides rowls and tubs of China to be ſtowed in the wings and other breakages, 2,300 lb. of ſago ſtarted, and about 35 tons of tutenauge, the ſame as kentiledge.

Deduct for private trade — — — — — — —	60
	1,173
The cargo brought into freight tons, after deducting for the private trade, laden on the *Engliſh* ſhip, exceeded the meaſured tonnage only — — Tons	52

The *Sophia Magdelena* brought, in 1778, from *China*, as follows.

Cheſts.	*Swediſh* lb.			Tons.
			Burthen	1,121
2,200, containing	810,361, of common bohea.			
	502,844, of congos, &c.			
		Engl. lb.		
Swediſh lb.	1,313,205, or *Engl.* lb	1,221,280		
Singlos, &c. greens	83,479, or *Engl.* lb.	77,635	*Engl.* lb.	
			1,298,915	
Swediſh lb.	1,396,684, beſides tea in canniſters		740	Freight tons.
				1,177
			Freight tons.	
301 Cheſts of China			82	
Silks and nankeens			6	
Drugs of ſorts			18	
				106
			Tons	1,283

Beſides rowls and tubs of China, and about 40 tons of tutenauge, the ſame as kentiledge.

Deduct for private trade		60
		1,223
Exceeded meaſured tonnage in freight tons, the private trade deducted	Tons	102

The *Stockholm* brought from *China*, in 1773, as follows

Chefts.	*Swediſh* lb.			Tons.
			Burthen	1,109
2,850, containing	1,023,073, of common bohea.			
	321,454, of congos, &c.			
		Engl. lb.		
Swediſh lb.	1,344,527, or *Engl.* lb.	1,250,410		
Green teas of ſorts	19,965, or *Engl.* lb.	18,567		
			Engl. lb.	
			1,268,977	
Swediſh lb.	1,364,492, beſides tea in canniſters		830	Freight tons.
				1,138
			Freight tons.	
332 Chefts of China ware	— — — — —		89	
Silks and nankeens	— — — — —		4	
Drugs of ſorts	— — — — —		21	
				114
			Tons	1,252
Beſides rowls and tubs of China and Sago ſtarted.				
Deduct for private trade	— — — — —		—	60
				1,192
Exceſs	— — — — —		Tons	83

The *Stockholm* brought from *China*, in 1776, as follows.

Chests.	*Swediſh* lb.			Tons.
			Burthen	1,109
1,700, containing	616,251, of common bohea.			
	614,615, of congo, &c.			
		Engl. lb.		
Swediſh lb.	1,230,866, or *Engl.* lb.	1,144,705		
Singlos, &c. greens	57,798, or *Engl.* lb	53,572	*Engl.* lb.	
			1,198,277	
Swediſh lb.	1,288,664, beſides tea in canniſters		840	Freight tons.
				1,083

	Freight tons.	
287 Cheſts of China ware — — — — —	79	
Silks and nankeens — — — — — —	3	
Drugs of ſorts — — — — — —	14	
		96
	Tons	1,179
Beſides rowls and tubs of China ware for the wings, &c. and about 30 tons of tutenauge, the ſame as kentiledge.		
Deduct for private trade — — — — — — —		60
		1,119
Ships tonnage — — — — — — —		1,109
The cargo brought into freight tons, after deducting for the private trade, exceeded the meaſured tonnage only — — — — — —	Tons	10

Theſe cargoes clearly prove, that the ſtowage turning to more or leſs advantage, ſo as to occaſion often times a conſiderable difference in the number of tons laden upon one voyage more than another, depends, in a great degree, upon the aſſortments of the goods. And hence it appears, an additional quantity of common bohea makes the principal difference in the quantity of tons contained in the cargoes of the ſame ſhip, on different voyages.

For the *Adolphi Frederick* of 1167 tons burthen, after deducting from the amount of her cargo 60 tons for the private trade, allowed to be laden on the *Engliſh* ſhip, did not, though part of the cargo conſiſted of 1500 cheſts of common bohea, exceed the builder's tonnage in the amount of the goods, more than 10 or 12 tons; and with only 1200 cheſts of common bohea laden, the ſame ſhip upon another voyage, was 34 tons under the meaſured tonnage, after the deduction was made for private trade. But with 2880 cheſts of common bohea, that ſhip exceeded the meaſured tonnage 101 tons.

The *Prince Guſtaff* of 1145 tons burthen, though 1800 cheſts of common bohea were laden, did not equal the meaſured tonnage of the ſhip, in the number of

freight tons contained in the cargo, after deducting 60 tons for private trade, only five tons; whilſt the ſame ſhip, upon another voyage, after the ſame deduction was made, did, with 2500 cheſts of common bohea in the cargo, exceed the tonnage of the ſhip in the number of freight tons laden, 48 tons.

The *Finland*, of 1115 tons burthen, with no more than 1200 cheſts of common bohea, after making the deduction for private trade, exceeded in freight tons the tonnage of the ſhip only 22 tons; but upon another voyage with 1800 cheſts of common bohea laden, and the ſame deduction being made, the exceſs came to 88 tons.

The *Sophia Magdelena*, with 1800 cheſts of common bohea on board, after deducting to the amount of 60 tons for private trade, out of the number of freight tons contained in the cargo, the remainder exceeded the meaſured tonnage of the ſhip 52 tons; and on another voyage with 2200 cheſts of common bohea laden, the ſame ſhip, after the ſame deduction had been made for private trade, exceeded the ſhip's meaſured tonnage 102 freight tons.

The *Stockholm*, with 2850 cheſts of common bohea, after deducting 60 tons for private trade, from the amount of the cargo, exceeeded the meaſured tonnage in the freight tons contained in the remainder of her cargo 83 tons; whilſt the ſame ſhip, with only 1700 cheſts of common bohea, exceeded the meaſured tonnage, after making the ſame deduction for private trade, no more than 10 tons. This proves ſufficiently what has been aſſerted concerning the aſſortments, and if the ſinglos laden on the *Engliſh* ſhips were to be converted, any conſiderable part of them, into congos or hyſons, thoſe ſhips would bring ſtill fewer freight tons than the beſt ſtowed ſhips among them have hitherto done, unleſs the quantity of common boheas was to be encreaſed. The larger ſhips, in that caſe, ſo far from exceeding the meaſured tonnage, would barely come up to it.

Theſe *Swediſh* ſhips do further ſhew, that the particular conſtruction of a ſhip will often affect the ſtowage in a much greater degree, than the meaſured difference will account for.

This may be inſtanced in the *Finland* and *Prince Guſtaff* in particular; the firſt has been always eſteemed a very burthenſome

thenſome ſhip in *Sweden*, and the *Prince Guſtaff* a very ſharp ſhip. And upon a comparative view of their burthens, and the contents of their reſpective cargoes, an advantage will be found in favour of the *Finland*, with reſpect to her capacity for ſtowage, beyond the proportional difference in the burthen of the two ſhips, to the amount of 60 or 70 tons; and a ſimilar difference may be found between more of the ſhips. The two ſhips above named have been pointed out in particular, becauſe the difference known to ſubſiſt in their conſtruction, has been given from authority. Theſe ſhips, it may be hoped, will further prove ſo to your ſatisfaction, as to leave no room for doubt, that a ſhip of 1100 tons burthen, will, with no aſſortments of goods brought from *China*, either for your account, or that of other nations, ſtow any thing near 350 freight tons beyond the builder's meaſured tonnage.

Theſe ſhips do certainly ſtrengthen and corroborate ſome of the opinions given in the Obſervations; and if they ſhall contribute to remove any doubts which may have ariſen on your minds, upon the ſubject of your ſhipping, the labour attending the inveſtigation will have been

beſtowed to much ſatisfaction on my part.

It may with great reaſon be conſidered as an irkſome painful taſk, or at leaſt an idle, and abſurd purſuit, to ſearch for truth, wherein, if the diſcovery is difficult to obtain, the ſlighteſt errors, if any ſhould ariſe, ſhall be imputed to deſign. If error is at all times to be conſidered as a ground for harſh conjectures and ungenerous reflections, how open to cenſure has the writer of thoſe publications laid himſelf? From his own pen, he will ſurely ſtand condemned! Let his performances then be left to decide upon his merits.

With reſpect to pepper cargoes: the Obſervations ſay, *that the ſhip loaded from Bencoolen with that commodity, would doubtleſs bring more than the builder's tonnage, even to a conſiderable amount, admitting the gun-room to be filled with bags of pepper.* However ſuch a ſtep the Obſervations explode, as highly improper in many reſpects, from its weight being liable to ſtrain the ſhip; for it would be very difficult to prevent the whole body of the pepper from bearing over to the ſide whenever the ſhip lays along; becauſe the pepper, if none of it was ſtarted at firſt, but ſtowed away in bags,

would

would ſoon begin to work looſe, and the bags by degrees to rot; the pepper too from the ſtraining and opening of the upper works, would find its way between the timbers And at the ſame time, that 16 cwt. of pepper, even if ſtarted, takes up as much, if not more room than eight or nine cwt. weight of tea; it is to be obſerved, that the cheſts of tea and all other light packages, whether cheſts or caſks, may eaſily be ſo ſhored up, as to prevent their bearing as heavy in proportion upon the ſide as pepper, whether it gets looſe or remains in bags, will unavoidably do. Now let it for a moment be conſidered, how a ſhip muſt be ſtrained in bad weather by 140 or 150 tons of pepper bearing over from ſide to ſide, or even from the weather-ſide to the midſhips, and from thence to the lee ſide. Pepper ſtowed in the hold, after laying to, for any time, in a gale of wind, upon one tack, has been found to liſt the ſhip, how then muſt the pepper operate in that reſpect, when ſtowed in bags or ſhot looſe ſo high up as to the middle deck.

Therefore, admitting the ſpace below the lower deck to be the only proper place to ſtow pepper in, to any great amount; let us then ſee how far the idea entertained

tained on that head in the Obſervations, has been verified or diſproved.

The *Pigot*, a ſhip of 711 tons, builder's meaſured tonnage, brought 699 tons of pepper in her hold, and no more ballaſt than the iron kentiledge: there were nine tons of private trade alſo ſtowed in the hold, which was completely filled from ſtem to ſtern, even the powder room had pepper ſtarted in it. The ſhip proved very tender, it has been aſſerted from good authority, and I doubt not but the commander, if the aſſertion is true, would readily confirm it, if appealed to, and who is certainly as able and experienced a ſeaman as any in the ſervice. Now if this ſhip had had 40 or 50 tons of ballaſt more in her bottom than were laden; there muſt have been a conſiderable quantity of pepper ſtowed between decks to have enabled the ſhip to take on board within 20 tons of her builder's meaſured tonnage. And if, beſides the above pepper, 41 tons of private trade had been laden on the lower deck, theſe added to the proper quantities of proviſions, water, and ſtores, would have placed a greater weight between decks than can be at all conſiſtent with the ſafety of the cargo, or the true intereſt of the concern.

It

It may be ſaid, that the *Bencoolen* ſhips generally carry a large quantity of arrack for private uſe and advantage, down to *St. Helena*—all which may be true: it has been found to be the cheapeſt method to ſupply the demands of the iſland; for as no veſſel is allowed to be kept at the iſland for that or any other purpoſes; the Company, or the Servants of the Company, by the Directors conſent, muſt carry arrack thither. The commander and his officers have a right to take on board to the amount of their indulgence in private trade. And ſometimes, by being ſparing in the quantity of water, there may have been laden a greater quantity of arrack than the amount of the indulgence. A meaſure, which now and then perhaps has been carried to exceſs, but no accident happening, has remained undiſcovered; however, ſuch a meaſure is never to be regularly authorized or approved—and ſeverely to be reprobated if ever it was found, that water, proviſions, or ſtores to any very conſiderable amount have been kept back for the ſtowage of goods, even on the Company's account.

The *York* meaſures 794 tons, and took on board 847 tons of pepper at *Bencoolen*; this

this ſhip had about 70 tons of ſtone ballaſt, and which was found barely ſufficient, with 130 or 140 tons of pepper above the lower deck. The ſhip brought away 50 bags of pepper in the ſteerage, which were afterwards ſtarted in the hold as the pepper ſettled; there were laden only 22 tons of private trade when the ſhip came into the river, and only 20 leagers of arrack were landed at *St. Helena*. If this ſhip's indulgence in private trade had been completed in drugs; the water and proviſions all ſtowed were they ought to have been, upon the lower deck; and the tiller left properly clear for working; there could not have been room for more than 60 or 70 tons of pepper the outſide, which would have been the utmoſt that, in prudence, ought to have been laden between decks; and then the cargo would not have amounted to the builder's tonnage by ſome tons.

The *Oſterly*'s meaſured tonnage is 775 tons, the cargo laden in pepper came to 802 tons; and exceeded the ſtandard given in the Obſervations, 47 tons. The indulgence in private trade was not laden by 28 tons; the pepper between decks 14 or 1500 bags; ſo that this ſhip by no means diſproves the general opinion given

in

in the Obſervations with reſpect to a pepper cargo.

The *Duke of Grafton*, indeed, has exceeded the builder's meaſured tonnage 187 tons. This ſhip brought from *Bencoolen* 1000 tons of pepper, 145 tons out of the 1000 were weighed from the lower deck after her arrival; if to this is added the pepper worked down between the timbers, and what was thrown overboard, there muſt originally have been full 200 tons or upwards ſtowed upon the lower deck. Surely no man converſant in the conſtruction of a ſhip, and the navigation to and from the *Eaſt Indies*, will ever attempt to defend carrying the ſtowage of the cargo to ſo improper an extent; as the conſequences muſt be too obvious, which will be likely in the end to reſult from ſuch conduct. Two hundred tons of pepper above the lower deck, with the uſual quantity of water, proviſions, cables, guns, and ſtores, bearing upon the ſides, for the ſpace of ſix months, as the ſhip rolls, or lays along, muſt have ſtrained and opened the ſtrongeſt ſhip to a very great degree, and would have made a mere ſieve of her upper works. If pepper gets looſe above the lower decks, it will ſoon work down between the timbers,

and by that means ſtop the channels to convey the water to the *well*; and which was really the caſe on board the *Grafton* The ballaſt laden in the bottom of that ſhip was not more than five or ſix and forty tons, and which proved to be by no means ſufficient for the ſafety and ſecurity of the ſhip and cargo, loaded as the ſhip appears to have been. If therefore 30 or 40 tons more of ballaſt had been laden in the *Grafton*'s hold, and admitting but 70 or 80 tons of pepper to have been ſtowed between decks, the ſhip would then have had very little if any more pepper on board, than to the amount of the builder's meaſured tonnage. Some of the chambers and other paſſages for the water, in all probability, had not been choaked up; nor the ſhip kept down for a conſiderable time upon the beam ends; no part of the cargo would then have been thrown overboard, to releaſe the ſhip; nor another part, to the amount of 120 tons and upwards, returned upon the owners, being damaged. The cargo brought by the *Grafton* from *Bencoolen*, conſiſted of a larger quantity of pepper than is to be juſtified either according to the common principles for loading the Company's ſhips in general, or by the trial and experiment

this

this particular ſhip has undergone. Surely no ſhip, conſiſtent with prudence, ought to be laden to ſuch an extraordinary degree, for her ſafety to depend upon the goodneſs of the weather, in a track of 7 or 8000 miles, through a variety of ſeaſons and climates. So that if a ſhip chances to ſail through any part of the homeward paſſage in the winter ſeaſon, ſhe muſt be expoſed to great danger, or the cargo at leaſt to the hazard of much loſs or damage. A ſhip that is not over laden, and is properly ballaſted, will never find it neceſſary to throw part of her cargo over board, in that gale of wind, wherein the maſts ſhall ſtand faſt. From the journal of the ſhip it appears, the upper works were weakened, and much opened by the great weight aloft; the decks in bad weather were none of them ever dry; the ſhip, in ſhort, became ſo open in the upper works, the pumps could ſcarcely keep her free, in the gales of wind: yet when the ſea ſubſided, the ſhip made little or no water, an evident proof the leaks lay aloft; and when ſome of the pepper had been thrown over board, the ſhip, as the journal obſerves, became more boyant and lively on the ſea. When the cargo ſhall have been examined and

all weighed off, the deficiency will not be leſs than 110 tons; excluſive of near 600 bags of damaged pepper, now laying in the warehouſe, to the amount of 75 tons, beſides a larger quantity of duſt than uſual, amounting to upwards of 30 tons, making together in deficiency, damage, and duſt, very little or nothing ſhort of 220 tons. And it is to be obſerved, that the pepper by ſoaking ſo long in ſalt water, as a great part of it muſt have done, from the quantities of water which lay at different times in the hold, and on the lower deck, muſt have imbibed an additional weight, which will be a long while before it is all exhauſted again. Theſe trials and experiments whereby ſhips become too deeply laden, theſe very improper ſteps with regard to loading your ſhips, had better be corrected in future; at leaſt, this rage for ſtowage ſhould be brought under ſome regulations; for otherwiſe, if ſuch trials are often repeated, ſome very diſagreeable conſequences muſt reſult in the end.

I ſhall now proceed to examine into the bale cargoes, in order to diſcover wherein the Obſervations have ſo groſly erred, as, in the opinion of this Commentator, they have done.

The

The author of the Obſervations ſays, *that ſome Gentlemen think the ſhips will bring the builders tonnage excluſive of kentiledge, from all the three Preſidencies, which he does at no rate allow will be the caſe from any one of them.*

He then goes on to ſtate, that, according to his opinion, the ſhips of 720 tons will not bring the meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge, from *Bengal* and *Madraſs*, in ſalt-petre, the uſual quantity of red-wood, and the reſt of the cargo bale or cheſt goods, unleſs 200 tons ſhall be laden in ſalt-petre. And then he ſuppoſes the cargo will oftener be under than over the meaſured tonnage.

Upon this computation I apprehend a ſhip of 720 tons is to have 410 tons in bale or cheſt goods. Nor is this calculation meant for any particular aſſortment of goods, but for the general average, taking the cargoes indiſcriminately as they ſhall chance to fall out; at leaſt, ſuch muſt be conſidered as the true meaning, if unprejudiced reaſon ſhall become the interpreter of the Obſervations. However, in deriſion of all that the author has aſſerted in the Obſervations, the Remarks in both publications have attacked the opinions given in them, on the ſub-

ject of the bale ſhips, with a great deal of acrimony, and very little ſound argument. The writer dwells much upon the *Naſſau*'s cargo, ſome years back; but wherein do the Obſervations attempt to diſguiſe or conceal the truth? the Obſervations, I believe, firſt brought that cargo forward from the records of the Company. And there it may be found, that the bale cargoes brought from *Bengal* and *Madraſs* between the years 1715 and 1765, amounted in number to 387 tons. And it may alſo be found, from the ſame records, that out of that number, the cargoes of the following ſhips only, appear to have exceeded the builder's meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge. A ſhip was ſaid to carry whole kentiledge, when the number of tons laden amounted to 16 *per cent.* upon the chartered tonnage; and half kentiledge when the quantity laden came only to eight *per cent.*

But as the ſhips of 700 tons burthen have uſually carried no more than 80 tons of kentiledge, for that reaſon, in framing the proportion in order to diſcover what the bale ſhips, any of them exceeded the builder's meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge, I ſhall give each ſhip 11½ *per cent.* on the meaſured tonnage, and which comes

neareſt

neareſt to the proportion of 80 tons to a ſhip of 700 tons burthen. And no other ſorts of goods than ſalt-petre, red-wood, and bale or cheſt packages, are upon this occaſion admitted into the comparative ſtatement; for though goods ſhot looſe, or thoſe ſtowed in bags, which may be put away in the wings or breakages, where nothing elſe would go, ſuch as pepper, cowries, and turmerick, are inſerted wherever they have been laden; ſtill they are by no means to be included in the compariſon between the bale cargoes hitherto brought home, and the general ſtandard given in the Obſervations.

In 1720, the *Dawſonne*, builder's meaſured tonnage				Tons 541
		Tons.		
Chartered at 480 tons to Coaſt and Bay.	Kentiledge at 11½ *per cent.*	62		
	Salt-petre and red-wood laden	178	Tons.	
			240	
	Bale and cheſt goods — — —		346	
				586
Exceeded the meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge				Tons 45

In 1728, the *Prince of Wales*, builder's meaſured tonnage				Tons 511
		Tons.		
Chartered at 480 tons loaded from *Madraſs*.	Kentiledge at 11½ *per cent.*	59		
	Salt-petre and red-wood laden	103	Tons.	
			162	
	Bale and cheſt goods laden — —		356	
				518
Exceeded the meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge				Tons 7

In 1733, the *Naſſau*, builder's meaſured tonnage — Tons 531

		Tons.	Tons.	Tons
Chartered at 480 tons to Coaſt and Bay.	Kentiledge at 11½ *per cent.*	61		
	Salt-petre and red-wood laden	156		
			217	
	Bale and cheſt goods laden — —		357	
				574

Cowries and tumerick ſtowed in the wings, and ſtarted 24 tons.

Exceeded the meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge — Tons 43

In 1736, the *Prince of Orange*, builder's meaſured tonnage — Tons 530

		Tons.	Tons.	Tons
Chartered at 480 tons loaded from *Madraſs*.	Kentiledge at 11½ *per cent.*	61		
	Salt-petre and red-wood laden	144		
			205	
	Bale and cheſt goods laden — —		360	
				565

Exceeded the meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge — Tons 35

In 1737, the *Naſſau*, builder's meaſured tonnage — Tons 531

		Tons.	Tons.	
Chartered at 480 tons, loaded from *Madraſs* and *Bencoolen*.	Kentiledge at 11½ *per cent.*	61		
	Salt-petre and red-wood laden	151		
			212	
	Bale and cheſt goods laden — —		356	
				568

Pepper ſtarted among the bales, 48 tons.
Exceeded the meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge — Tons 37

In 1737, the *Prince William*, builder's meaſured tonnage — Tons 504

		Tons.	Tons.	
Chartered at 470 tons, to Coaſt and Bay.	Kentiledge at 11½ *per cent.* laden in iron and lead — —	58		
	Salt petre and red-wood laden	102		
			160	
	Bale and cheſt goods laden — —		350	
				510

Beſides 48 tons of pepper ſtarted; and ſix tons of iron and lead as additional kentiledge.
Exceeded the builder's meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge — — — — — — Tons 6

The dimenſions of theſe ſix ſhips being known, the exceſs in goods and kentiledge beyond the meaſured tonnage, has been exactly aſcertained, amounting in four of the ſhips from 35 to 45 tons, and in the other two only to ſix and ſeven tons; beſides theſe, ten more ſhips out of the 387 loaded with bale cargoes, appear to have exceeded in cheſt and bale goods, ſalt-petre, red-wood, and kentiledge, from 10 to 50 tons, or thereabout. The ten ſhips were the *Marlborough*, in 1718, from *China* and Fort *St. George*; the *Hanover*, in 1718; the *Mary*, in 1724; the *Derby*, in 1725; the *Eyles*, in 1730; the *Godolphin*, in 1736; the *Beaufort*, in 1739; the *Grantham*, in 1740; the *Durrington*, in 1741; and the *Durrington*, in 1745, all from Coaſt and Bay. The exceedings in theſe ten ſhips can only be eſtimated from the chartered tonnage, and the men and guns ſet down for each ſhip upon the Company's books. Taking that rule for a guide, and then comparing them with thoſe ſhips whoſe meaſured tonnage has been diſcovered; the exceſs in bale or cheſt goods, red-wood, ſalt-petre, and kentiledge, could not be more to all appearance than from 40 to 50 tons upon

three of the ſhips, and from 10 to 30 tons upon the other ſeven ſhips.

Theſe ſhips contained the largeſt cargoes, confined to bale or cheſt goods, ſalt-petre, and red-wood, which were brought home in the ſpace of 50 years. So that out of the 287 ſhips returned to *England* from Coaſt and Bay, between the years 1715 and 1765, not 20, upon a general ſurvey of the bale ſhips, appear to have exceeded the meaſured tonnage in the above aſſortments of goods, and in kentiledge; the reſt having brought no more than to the amount of the meaſured tonnage, including kentiledge, and many of them leſs than the meaſured tonnage by ſeveral tons. The *Dawſon* in 1720, the * *Naſſau* in 1733, and the *Durrington* in 1741, ſeem to have brought home the greateſt number of tons in bale or cheſt goods, ſalt-petre, and red wood, in proportion to their reſpective tonnage; the *Dawſonne* in 1720, and the *Naſſau* in 1733 and in 1737 brought in net goods,

* The *Naſſau* in 1733, brought 80 tons of private trade, exceeding the uſual indulgence 30 tons. This exceſs conſiſted of 12 tons of *Lazeretta* ſtores, arrack, mangoes, &c. and 18 tons lay in gallinga and China root, which were ſtarted.

under

under the above aſſortments within from 24 to 17 tons of their meaſured tonnage; and the * *Durrington*, if her meaſurement may be aſcertained from the chartered tonnage, muſt have brought in 1741, within ſeven or eight tons of her burthen in net goods, conſiſting of bale or cheſt packages, ſalt-petre, and red wood.

As to the articles of pepper, cowries, or turmerick, either ſtarted looſe, or ſtowed in bags in holes and corners where no packages could go of any conſiderable ſize, and which otherwiſe muſt be left vacant, or filled up with dunnage. Such aſſortments of goods have nothing to do with the preſent argument, as they cannot in fairneſs be brought to contradict the Obſervations. And it muſt be obvious to every man converſant in the ſtowage of bale cargoes, that there are always vacant ſpaces not to be avoided, ſufficient to admit into every bale ſhip 50 or 60 tons of pepper, cowries, and turmerick, to be ſtarted among the bales,

* The *Durrington* had not the indulgence in private trade by 20 tons in any of thoſe aſſortments of goods, contained in packages; as there were only 42 tons in all, and 14 tons conſiſted of ratteens and canes, which were chiefly uſed for dunnage to the cargo.

or a part to be ſtowed in bags in the ſeveral breakages, where no other ſorts of goods could be put.

Upon this ground the author of the Obſervations ſeems to ſtand firm, and I hope will never ſuffer himſelf to be diſlodged by mere conjecture or aſſertion, eſpecially when thoſe perſons who have endeavoured to diſcredit his reſearches, ſhall be found to have erred to a very great degree in moſt of their aſſertions.

The author of the Obſervations has ſaid, that he thinks it doubtful whether the ſhips in general will be able to ſtow to the full amount of the builder's meaſured tonnage, kentiledge included; and further obſerves, that the truth can only be diſcovered by a perfect knowledge of the quantity of goods, which ſhips of the different ſizes ſhall be found capable to bring home. And till experience contradicts him, he muſt continue to differ in opinion from thoſe gentlemen, who aſſert that the ſhips will all of them bring the builder's meaſured tonnage, excluſive of the kentiledge. What is there in this reaſoning, looks like aiming to miſlead? Or wherein have the Obſervations been miſtaken, as to the general principle laid down by the author for bale cargoes?

And

And now ſince it evidently appears that a very conſiderable number of ſhips, through a ſpace of 50 years, have come home either ſhort of, or only equal to the builder's tonnage, kentiledge included, is there not the faireſt ground to conclude that thoſe few which have exceeded the ſtandard, have been enabled ſo to do, either from favour ſhewn them, or elſe from the bales happening by accident to turn out very advantageous for ſtowage.

But in order to remove every objection which may be ſtarted from the diſtance of time, from the knowledge of the meaſured tonnage of many ſhips being loſt, and from other circumſtances; recourſe ſhall be had to a more modern date.

The *Dutton* was chartered in 1773 upon a new ſyſtem, different from any of the other ſhips of that ſeaſon. Freight was to be paid at one ſtipulated price * for the kentiledge, and for every ton of goods brought home; conſequently as much was to be laden as the ſhip could ſtow, and orders accordingly went out to ſupply the ſhip with goods at all events, as long as the commander ſhould require.

* 23 l. 10s. *per ton*, goods and kentiledge.

The

The cargo conſiſted of bale and cheſt goods — —			Tons. 341	
Salt-petre	Tons 267			
Red wood —	29	Tons.		
		296		
Kentiledge — —		82		
			378	Tons.
				719
Turmerick * — —		13		
Cowries — —		15		28 Tons.
				747
Deduct for the difference between 67 tons of ſalt-petre, and the ſame ſpace occupied by bales † — —				36
Deduct the turmerick and cowries, not to be taken into the compariſon —				28
				64
Amount of the cargo, kentiledge included, on a fair compariſon with the ſtandard given in the Obſervations — — — —				Tons 683

* Part were ſtarted, and the reſt in all reſpects the ſame as ſhot looſe goods.

† A ton of ſalt-petre when beat meaſures 27 C. feet, therefore the 67 tons of ſalt-petre contain — — — — C.F. 1809

Theſe converted into bale tons of only 60 C. feet each, give but 30 tons of bale goods the outſide.

Builder's meaſured tonnage of the *Dutton*	Tons 694
The cargo, including kentiledge, on a fair compariſon — — — —	683
Short of builder's tonnage — —	Tons 11

Thus the cargo would have turned out 10 tons ſhort of the builder's meaſured tonnage, taking the kentiledge into the account, if in the lieu of 66 tons exceſs in ſalt-petre a proportionable quantity of bales had been laden. For as to the turmerick or cowries, whether ſtarted or in bags, they were all ſtowed away either in the run, or in breakages, were no bale goods could be put, and can by no means be brought into the compariſon to contradict the Obſervations. The *Dutton*'s hold was admitted to have been full by the inſpecting officers; and there appeared to have been little or no private trade in it; only 12 bales where ſtowed there at the ſhip's departure from *Bengal*.

In the lazeretta, that is, from the ſtern to the after part of the ſtep of the jeer-capſtan.

When the *Dutton* left *Bengal*, the following goods and ſtores were ſtowed above the lower deck, 108 buts of water, moſt of the ſalt proviſions, and ſix or ſeven leagers of arrack.

From the bulkhead of the lazeretta to the after part of the main-maſt.

The cable tiers lay on each ſide; the cables not complete, conſiſting of only a cable and a half on

the ſheet and beſt bower; bags of lacks were ſtowed into the ſide where the tiers rounded off; between the tiers at the fore part of the main-hatch way there were four butts of water, the room over the butts was ſtowed up with cordage. The ſtream-cable, and the lower and top-maſt-ſhrowd-hawſers were left in *India*.

From the after part of the main-maſt to the gun-room bulk-head, which ſtood about four feet abaft the hatch-way.

In the midſhips, from the fore part of the after-hatch-way to the ſhot-locker, a rice-room was built up; from the after part of the hatch-way to the gun-room bulk-head, paddy and peaſe rooms ſtood. From the crowns of the tiers of each ſide to the bulk-head of the gun-room, paſſengers baggage was put away.

From the bulk-head of the gun-room to the tranſom.

The following articles were ſtowed in the gun-room, viz. two bales of the Company's; one cheſt of bandannoes, private trade; 56 cheſts of lacks, Company's and private; 25 pipes of *Maderia* wine; 30 jars of biſcuit; eight cheſts of apparel; two arm-cheſts; ſundry gunner's ſtores; and the ſpare ſails: theſe

theſe ſeveral articles completely filled the gun-room.

Upon the middle deck 12 butts of water and ſeven or eight caſks of proviſions were ſtowed. Upon the quarter-deck lay five pipes of wine, and ſeveral paſſengers cheſts; againſt the booms of each ſide 16 caſks of water; and the ſteerage was ſo full as only to leave room ſufficient for working the vial. The room occupied by paſſengers baggage upon the lower deck, amounted to about 12 or 1300 cubic feet, and would not have ſtowed away, allowing for all the breakages, more goods than the commander and officers were entitled to take on board. For the private trade laden on that ſhip came to no more than 33 tons, and the allowance is 50 tons.

I think no ſeaman can be found who will ſay the ſhip was not filled? And if ſhe was filled, then it is very plain that ſhips in general, with 200 tons of ſaltpetre and two thirds of the cargo bale goods (which the *Dutton* had not by 50 or 60 tons), will not exceed the builder's meaſured tonnage, kentiledge included; without the packages fall out remarkably well for ſtowage; which, from the nature of the bale cargoes, will ſeldom be the caſe: for, as has been repeatedly obſerved,

goods ſhot looſe, or ſimilar to kentledge goods when exceeding 200 tons in quantity, have nothing to do with this argument,

However, to ſupport the aſſertions contained in the Obſervations, with ſtill ſtronger proofs, the following reference has been made to the cargoes of the *Houghton* and *Latham*, two ſhips which arrived from *Bengal* in 1774.

	Tons.
The *Latham*'s meaſured tonnage	723
The *Houghton*'s meaſured tonnage	718
Difference Tons	5

Goods laden on the *Houghton* upon the Company's account.

	Tons.	
Bales of piece goods — —	206	
Bales of raw ſilk — —	50	
Bales of cotton yarn — —	5	Tons
		261
Salt petre — — — —	231	
Red-wood — — — —	28	
Cowries — — — —	15	
		274
		Total

Total of goods laden for the Company		535
Private trade laden in the hold —		9
		544
Kentiledge — — — — —		80
Total laden in the hold in the *Houghton* — — — — —		624

Goods laden on the *Latham* upon the Company's account.

	Tons.	
Bales of piece goods — —	195	
Bales of raw ſilk — — —	39	
Bales of cotton yarn — —	3	
Cheſts of ſhellack — — —	1	Tons
		238
Salt-petre — — — —	197	
Red-wood — — — —	29	
		226
		464
Private trade in the hold none.		
Kentiledge — — — — —		80
Total laden in the *Latham*'s hold Tons		544

Laden in freight tons in the *Houghton*'s hold more than in the *Latham*'s, 80 tons, 71 tons of which conſiſted of Company's goods.

Theſe

Theſe two ſhips ſailed the ſame ſeaſon from *Bengal*; and if they had been completely loaded, one ſhip would have brought more goods than the other by many tons. When theſe two ſhips arrived in the river of *Thames*, and their holds were opened, the inſpecting officers reported, that the vacant ſpaces in the *Houghton*'s hold amounted to C.F. 10,500

And that the vacant ſpaces in the *Latham*'s hold meaſured only — — — Cub. F. 7,932

The difference amounting to C. F. 2,568

Brought into tons at 64 feet to the ton, amounts to 40 tons; hence it appears that ſo much leſs room unoccupied, was found in the *Latham*'s, than in the *Houghton*'s hold. If therefore Tons.

to this — — — — 40

Be added the additional tons of goods laden in the *Houghton*'s hold more than in the *Latham*'s amounting to — — — 80

And likewiſe what the *Latham*'s meaſured tonnage exceeded that of the *Houghton*, being — 5

Theſe together making Tons 125

Shew

Shew that 544 tons in goods and kentiledge, laden on the *Houghton*, lay in almoſt one quarter part leſs room than the ſame quantity of tonnage took up on board the *Latham*. For by this ſtatement it appears, that the *Houghton* ſtowed after the rate of 589 tons of goods of different ſorts, in the ſame ſpace the *Latham* ſtowed * 464 tons of different ſorts of goods.

If this circumſtance ſhall carry no conviction to the minds of men, it will be difficult to ſay what can convince them of theſe miſtaken opinions. And had theſe two ſhips been completely loaded, the difference that muſt have ariſen from the qualities of the cargoes, by one ſhip ſtowing more goods than the other, would have been ſeverely felt by the Owners.

It plainly appears from this inveſtigation, the two ſhips had by no means an equal diſtribution of the Company's goods; one having 71 tons laden more than the other, and conſequently from ſuch indulgence an advantage of 17 or 1800 l. accrued to the Owners of one ſhip, which in juſtice, and for the true intereſt of the

* Eight tons of coarſe goods of ſome aſſortments, have been found to occupy the ſame room that 11 tons of fine goods have been ſtowed in.

Company, ſhould have been divided between the Owners of both, for the more equal the earnings, the better will the Directors be enabled to aſcertain the fair and reaſonable equivalent which ought to be allowed to all the Owners alike for their riſk and expence.

It muſt be evident to every man converſant in the packing or ſtowing bale goods, that if two equal number of pieces of cloth or linen, all of the ſame lengths and breadths, yet of different degrees of fineneſs in one parcel than in the other, ſhould be placed ſeparate, and then the number be encreaſed in one parcel or diminiſhed from the other, ſtill it will be found very difficult, if not often impoſſible, to reduce the packages whilſt the aſſortments they are compoſed of vary, to the ſame dimenſions, in every reſpect. And the ſame inequality will ariſe in the dimenſions of the bales, beyond the power of prevention, where the goods, though of equal texture are of different lengths and breadths.

Now whenever, from the variety of aſſortments, a great diverſity abounds in the ſize of the packages; it will become impoſſible to lay them in rows, or to pile them upon each other, to the ſame advantage,

vantage, as if the packages were entirely alike, this is too evident to be contended.

Every ſeaman, bred up in the *Indian* ſervice knows, that the bales laden in a ſeaſon from *Bengal* or *Madraſs*, but more particularly from the firſt place, vary ſo much in their aſſortments, and conſiſt of ſuch a variety of packages, as ſeldom to fall out alike advantageous for ſtowage. So that turn and place the bales with the utmoſt care and attention, greater breakages will ariſe from ſome cargoes than from others in the filling up.

The difference in the ſizes of the bales from the quality of the goods, and the number of aſſortments they have been found often times to conſiſt of, has made a difference between the cargo of one ſhip compared with the cargo of another, where the aſſortments have been both fewer and finer, and conſequently better for ſtowage, of 14 or 15 cubit feet upon an average in every ton.

Whereas two ſhips having 360 tons each in bale goods, if the bales in one ſhip were to occupy only 10 cubit feet more in every ton than thoſe laden on the other, a difference will ariſe in the occupied ſpaces of the two ſhips, equal

to 60 tons, of 60 cubical feet each. And this great difference, in the qualities of the goods for compactneſs of ſtowage, found to prevail among the variety of aſſortments in the *Bengal* and *Madraſs* cargoes, but more particularly thoſe from the *Bay*, will ſufficiently explain why ſo many ſhips have brought home only to the amount of the builder's meaſured tonnage, kentiledge included, and ſeveral much leſs; whilſt a few ſhips from the ſame places have exceeded the builder's meaſured tonnage in goods and kentiledge to the amount of 30 or 40 tons. I make no doubt therefore, whenever a ſhip's cargo from Coaſt and Bay has proved remarkably advantageous for ſtowage, the invoice would be found to conſiſt of but few aſſortments, and thoſe moſtly of the finer ſorts of goods. Which opinion, with reſpect to the different aſſortments being few in number, where the cargoes have ſtowed to moſt advantage, the following ſtatement will ſhew.

	Tons.
Latham brought in 1774, bale goods 239, contained in different sized packages — — — — — —	165
Houghton ditto in 1774, bale goods 261, contained in different sized packages — — — — — — —	111
Dutton ditto in 1775, bale goods 341, contained in different sized packages — — — — — — —	119
Durrington ditto in 1741, bale goods 364, contained in different sized packages only — — — — — —	91
Naſſau ditto in 1733, bale goods 356, contained in different sized packages no more than — — — — —	55

This ſubject of ſtowage has been much perplext by the viſionary aſſertions of ſpeculative men; who have laboured to inculcate an idle opinion that any given ſpace would ſtow as many freight tons, as there were diviſions contained in it of 40 or 50 cubical feet each.

This is erroneous, not only as to the various dimenſions of the freight ton, but falſe as to the principle it is grounded on. Yet ſuch is the obſtinacy and pride of human nature, that the idea has been ſtubbornly maintained, becauſe men cannot be brought to abandon an error, they have once publicly avowed.

In conſequence of an order from the Committee of Shipping, to examine into the vacant ſpaces in the hold of every ſhip upon her arrival. the following reports from the inſpecting officers, and the replies given into the Committee by two experienced commanders, are to be found upon the Company's records.

The inſpecting officers, *Auguſt* 1ſt, 1774, report: *We have been on board the Northington at Erith, ſaw her lower deck hatches all unlaid, and there appeared full ſtowed. And the following is the cubical content of that part of the bread-room that*

we

we found unſtowed (without allowing for dunnage, breakage, or any private trade diſperſed therein) viz. 1959 *feet, which at* 40 *feet per ton is equal to* 48 *tons,* 39 *feet.*

(Signed) GAB. SNODGRASS.
T. WARNER.

The ſame day the inſpecting officers alſo report: *We have been on board the Egmont, at Deptford, ſaw her main and fore-hatches unlaid, and there appeared full ſtowed. The after-hatches was not filled up, the vacancy there, added to the unſtowed part of the bread-room, amounted to* 1489 *cubical feet, which at* 40 *feet to the ton, is equal to* 37 *tons, nine feet, without allowing for dunnage, breakage, or any private trade diſperſed therein.*

(Signed) GAB. SNODGRASS.
T. WARNER.

The Commanders being called upon, the following reply was read in the Committee the 31ſt of *Auguſt* 1774, from Captain *Sealy* of the *Northington:*

Copy

Copy of a Letter, ſigned *John Sealy*, dated *Auguſt* 12th 1774, addreſſed to the Committee of Shipping.

Honourable Sirs,

WHEN I was called upon in regard to the *Northington*'s bread-room, I was much ſurpriſed to hear Mr. *Snodgraſs* report, that there was ſo much vacancy as would have contained about 40 tons; upon which I deſired my officer to ſtow it full of bales, and as per incloſed letter, it appears that the vacancy was only about 12 tons *. I hope you'll pardon my troubling you with this.

(Signed) JOHN SEALY.

P. S. The bread-room ſhall remain ſtowed till I know your pleaſure.

The encloſed Letter referred to by Captain *Sealy*, from his officer was as follows.

Sir,

ACCORDING to your orders, I have ſtowed the bread-room, which has taken

* Thus, that room the inſpecting officers report to be equal to the ſtowage of about 40 tons, held not more than 70 bales, which could at no rate exceed 15 or 16 tons, admitting they were the aſſortments moſt advantageous for ſtowage.

* 82 bales; but ſince Mr. *Snodgraſs* meaſured it, there has been ſeveral things taken out, to the amount of at leaſt 12 bales.

(Signed) THO. AUDLEY.

Ship *Northington*,
Red Houſe, 10th
Auguſt 1774.

The 31ſt of *Auguſt* 1774, Captain *Mears* of the *Egmont*, delivered in the following Letter, which he had received from his officer.

Ship *Egmont*, *Aug.* 17, 1774.

Sir,

UNDERNEATH are the marks and numbers of the bales which were ſtowed in the breakages of the bread-room, and filled quite up, and likewiſe the *St. Helena* ſtores which were ſtowed in the after-hold, with which it was quite full.

(Signed) PETER CHURCHILL.

In the bread room.

ST Lack †, N° 9. 11. 21. 10. 13. 7. 1. 5. 19. } 9 bales

* Theſe 82 bales could not exceed 18 or 19 tons at moſt, ſuppoſing them all fine goods.

† Theſe 38 packages could not amount to more than 9 or 10 tons the outſide.

Cosm. N° 5. 34. 113. 87. 101. 96. 107. 93, 94. 109. 86, 87. 97. 111. 95. 113. 100. 99. 1, 2. 7. 2.	22 bundles or bales of raw silk.	
Comf. 100. 91. 102. 103. 88.	5 bales raw silk.	
Lace 385.	1 bale	about 10 tons.
NICHNT 38	1 bale.	

In the after-hold.

60 bags rice 2 bales of gunnies	about 5 tons.

From hence it appears that the vacant spaces on board the *Northington*, which had been represented to be equal to 48 tons and upwards, at 40 cubic feet to a ton, did not, when stowed full with bales, contain to near half that amount in freight tons. And as to the *Egmont*'s vacant spaces represented as equal to 37 tons, those vacancies could not, from the officer's report laid before the Committee of Shipping, contain more than 15 or 16 freight tons the outside, including the five tons of stores delivered at the island of *St. Helena*.

The consultations of the Board of Trade at *Bengal* in *October* and *November* 1777, shew, that their opinions about the bale cargoes,

cargoes, correſpond in a great degree, with thoſe given in the Obſervations. And from *Bengal* this ſeaſon the *Europa*, of 693 tons, has brought only 637 tons, including kentiledge, and 35 tons of the cargo cowries; ſo that taking the cowries into the account, ſtill the cargo is ſhort 56 tons of the meaſured tonnage of the ſhip.

The *Ceres*, of 740 tons, has brought 620 tons of net goods, and, after including the kentiledge, is ſhort of the meaſured tonnage 32 tons. The *Houghton*, filled up at Fort *St. George*, has brought 723 tons, including 86 tons of kentiledge; the builder's meaſured tonnage of 718 tons, conſequently the tonnage of the cargo, including kentiledge, has exceeded the tonnage of the ſhip five tons. There are ſeven ſhips arrived this year from *China*, and not one has brought in net goods to the amount of the meaſured tonnage, excluſive of the kentiledge; on the contrary, they are ſhort of that amount from 42 to 116 tons.

What has been here laid down will ſurely be ſufficient to carry conviction to the mind of every man, who does not chuſe to live at enmity with truth, rather than recede from haſty concluſions, which

had originated in error, and been maintained with much obſtinacy.

Before this ſubject of the tonnage is cloſed, it may not be improper to ſay ſomething on the alterations which have taken place in the modes of chartering the ſhips. The kentiledge is now paid for at the whole freight price, whether the cargo is bulky, or ſtows to much advantage. And one ſhip, the *Dutton*, was let to *Bengal* in 1773, to bring home as many goods as could be ſtowed, at 23l. 10s. *per* ton; and this ſcheme was talked on at the time as very advantageous for the Company. The ſhip brought home 747 tons, including 82 tons of kentiledge, and the freight came to 17,554l.

On the old method of regulating the freights, if that ſhip had been let for 600 tons certain, and chartered to receive 27l. *per* ton for the goods diſtinguiſhed under the title of gruff goods; and 30l. *per* ton for bale or cheſt goods; with the kentiledge at 9l. *per* ton, to be adjuſted according to the quantity of goods put on board in *India*; and ſurplus tonnage to be paid for at half freight; in that caſe, the goods brought by the *Dutton* would have coſt 17,190l. for the freight of them home, which amounts to 360l. leſs than

the

the freight came to at 23 l. 10 s. *per* ton. Now if more goods ſtill had been laden, and at the time the *Dutton* was let to the Company, I am inclined to think the Owners were led to expect the ſhip would have been able to take more on board; in which caſe the Owners would have received for every additional ton 23 l. 10 s. whilſt upon the old mode of half freight no more would have been paid than 13 l. 10 s. So that if the ſhip had been able to have received 70 tons beyond the quantity laden, according to the old method of chartering the ſhip, the goods would have come home cheaper by 1000 l. and upwards, than the ſame quantity would have been brought for, after the rate the *Dutton* was let at, of 23 l. 10 s. *per* ton, for every ton of goods and kentiledge put on board.

The *York* has been found to meaſure 36 tons more than the contract. And the writer of the Remarks aſſerts, that ſhip had on board 1071 tons when ſhe ſailed from the river *Thames*. Now what does this aſſertion prove? Nothing againſt the Obſervations. The ſhip might have laden in goods, kentiledge, and ſtores to that amount; and if ſo, all that reſults

from the diſcovery, is, that as the Company had 737 tons of goods on board, the private traders 80 tons, and the kentiledge amounted to 92 tons; therefore the ſtores, water, and proviſions muſt have been equal to 162 tons.

A certain Director has been pointed out for the ſuppoſed author of the Obſervations; and the conſtructions put upon them, are calculated to impreſs you with an idea, that Director's aim has been to diſguiſe the truth, in order to deceive his conſtituents; and thereby ſacrifice your intereſts to thoſe of his more particular friends, the ſhip-huſband. However, without the ſmalleſt view or intent to injure the truſt you have repoſed in him, I dare venture to affirm, that Director will always be happy to acknowledge the friendſhip and ſupport he has found from ſeveral of thoſe ſhip-huſbands, and particularly from a late departed friend from among them.

It is very immaterial who was the author of thoſe Obſervations; and equally ſo, whether he was an Owner, a Ship-huſband, or Proprietor; nay, admitting him to have been a Director at the time they were wrote, what do thoſe Obſervations contain to ſubject the author to the cenſure

of

of acting unworthy the truſt you had repoſed in him? Wherein does the pamphlet ſhew a diſpoſition to neglect your intereſts? It cannot ſurely conſiſt in any of the explanations given in the Obſervations; nor can the pamphlet be charged with aiming to divert your attention from the ſubject of your ſhipping, or to incline you to take any thing upon truſt; on the contrary, it is rather calculated to throw you upon your guard, by pointing out the variety of circumſtances which ariſe to puzzle and perplex the inveſtigation; in the diverſity of the cargoes, not only from different places, but even from the ſame place. The author of the Obſervations ſeems to have ſpoke with diffidence when a mere opinion is given, and to have pronounced with certainty only where facts are ready to ſupport him. What then is there in the Obſervations that wears an appearance of endeavouring to miſlead? Surely candour can never attempt to put ſuch a conſtruction on any part of them. They ſeem to exhibit to you nothing more than an earneſt deſire to diſcover the truth; by affording ſome aſſiſtance to thoſe intereſted in the ſearch.

If

If experience ſhall be found to contradict the Obſervations on any material point, the author, whatever ſtation he may hold under you, can meet refutation without the leaſt diſgrace; nor need he heſitate a moment if miſtaken, to acknowledge his error. For wherein has he been poſitive or aſſuming in his arguments, or offered to exult over the miſtakes of others? When men proceed with temper and caution in their ſearch after truth, the community will readily exempt them from cenſure, though they may have erred. For ſurely men may fall into error in the purſuit, without becoming criminal, and conſequently without deſerving reproach, or any ungenerous conſtructions on their conduct. But when we take up the character of cenſors, and preſume to place ourſelves in the chair of correction, upon the ground of our own aſſertions, exerciſing, with an air of triumph, reproof over others; and imputing conjectural errors to the baſeſt motives. If, under ſuch character, it ſhould be afterwards diſcovered, that we had been miſtaken both in our own aſſerted facts, and in our conjectures concerning errors in other men; ſo ſituated, we muſt expect to

loſe

loſe all credit with a diſcerning public, and to have our appeals make no impreſſion; but to paſs diſregarded and unheeded into oblivion upon all future occaſions.

The contract between the Company and the Owners of the ſhipping employed in the ſervice, was fixt upon a ſounder foundation, all contengencies more effectually provided for, and diſputes more eaſily ſettled or adjuſted, under the old, than under the preſent charter party; at leaſt the rights of the Company were much better defined and ſecured; for the neceſſary checks and penalties to prevent colluſions were aſcertained in a clearer manner; beſides, the Directors held a more effectual controul, a much more eſſential authority over the commander of the ſhip.

With reſpect to the limitations for ſtowage under the old charter-parties, the Company became entitled to occupy any ſpare room left after the contract tonnage was laden; at the ſame time, the Company lay under no compulſion to pay for the room, if goods were not laden; and which the Directors are obliged to do at preſent. The freight price paid for the kentiledge was ſeldom or ever more than

10l. *per* ton, and only reckoned into the chartered tonnage under particular circumſtances. It was admitted on the part of the owner, whenever the cargo became ſo bulky and cumberſome, or ſtone ballaſt to a large amount ſo neceſſary, that the owner would forfeit his contract, without the kentiledge or iron ballaſt was allowed to be reckoned as part of the contract tonnage. And the ſame indulgence was admitted on the part of the Company, if by any unforeſeen accident a ſufficient quantity of goods equal to the contract tonnage, could not be ſupplied; in which caſe the Company was relieved from paying more than 9 or 10l. * *per* ton, ſo far as the kentiledge extended. A ſhip under either of theſe circumſtances was termed to be dead-freighted.

On the other hand, whenever there were goods ſufficient in the hands of the Company's agents to fill the ſhip, and the quantity laden exceeded the chartered tonnage; in ſuch caſe, as many of the additional tons of goods laden, as equalled the quantity of kentiledge ordered by charter-party, were paid for only at the

* The kentiledge was always rated at $\frac{1}{3}$ *per* ton of the lower freight.

loweſt

loweſt freight price, if gruff goods; conſolidating into the account, as part of the freight price, the 9 or 10 l. *per* ton paid for the kentiledge. So that, in fact, when the contract tonnage became completed in goods, no freight was paid for the kentiledge; and for all the goods laden more than the amount of the chartered tonnage only half freight was paid; and the prices were regulated by the two different aſſortments; that is, according as the ſurplus conſiſted of gruff, or of fine goods. The price paid for the kentiledge being thus reduced in proportion as the cargo proved advantageous for ſtowage; the advantage turned very much in favour of the company, whenever goods were laden beyond the contract: for no more was thrown into the owner's ſcale than became neceſſary to induce him to be attentive to the ſtowage: whereas the advantage which can ariſe from the ſtowage of a greater quanity of goods at one time than at another, muſt, under the preſent charter-party, preponderate entirely in favour of the owner. For whether the cargo ſhall prove advantageous for ſtowage or otherwiſe, whether a greater or a leſſer quantity of goods are laden; nevertheleſs 80 or 90 tons of kentiledge are to be

paid for at an high freight; and under no circumſtances are any deductions on that head provided for. Surely every man weighing the diverſity found in the cargoes, as to their convenience for ſtowage, will readily agree, that the preſent ſyſtem of ſettling the freights is not, if the ſhips are full laden, near ſo beneficial for the Company, as the old one.

If there does ſubſiſt a difference in the cargoes brought even from the ſame ſettlement, owing to the aſſortments varying very much in the ſize of their packages, and which there can remain no room to doubt of; in ſuch caſe, if a ſhip is chartered at the tonnage which is only to be brought with a favourable cargo, ſhe muſt be liable to forfeit her contract with a very bulky cargo; or elſe the contract muſt be made in ſuch a vague manner, (which is too much the caſe at preſent) as will not be ſufficiently binding to procure redreſs in all caſes wherein the Company may be materially injured. Again, if the chartered tonnage ſhall be regulated by the worſt cargo for ſtowage; then, after all this conteſt and diſpute upon that head, the chartered tonnage muſt be fixed ſomething near the ſtandard laid down in the Obſervations.

If

If a ſhip can bring a greater number of tons, than are allotted in the Obſervations, each ſpecific ton may certainly be brought home cheaper than the author has eſtimated by his calculation. And conſequently a conſiderable advantage will reſult thereby to the Company. However the mere letting a ſhip to bring a certain quantity of goods, cannot enable her to ſtow them, if there is not room; and if there ſhall be room at any time, to enable a ſhip to ſtow to the amount of the builder's tonnage, the Company would be equally capable of lading to that amount, under the old charter-party, as under any of the new ones. Or on the other hand, if the owner was aſſured of a certain ſum for his ſhip, and which propoſition has been held forth, there never would be the ſame pains taken in the ſtowage, as when the goods are paid for by the ton; becauſe if the owner was to receive the ſame reward, whether his ſhip brought home more or leſs goods; in order the better to guard againſt damage, the dunnage would often be encreaſed; for the owner would be particularly cautious to avoid expoſing the cargo to the hazard of being injured, ſo long as he muſt make any ſuch injury good to the Company. The leaſt reflection muſt

tell us, that no ſituation can ſo effectually ſecure the ſhip to be fully laden, and to have great attention paid to the ſtowage of the cargo, as the reward to the owner depending on the quantity of goods put on board. This is the only circumſtance can make him intereſted to take on board as much as ever can be received with ſafety: for whilſt the owner is to pay for the goods which are damaged, he muſt have the right to decide on the mode of ſtowing thoſe goods away.

As for the ſuppoſed author of the Obſervations, who, being a Director, has been cenſured by this writer for preferring the intereſt of his ſhipping friends to that of the Proprietors and the duty of his truſt; let the public ſentiments left in *Auguſt* 1775, by that Director upon the minutes of the Committee of Shipping, anſwer for him to you, his conſtituents, whether any part of his conduct could merit thoſe ungenerous reflections which have been thrown out; ſuch as aiming to prevent a diſcovery of the different ſhips capacities for ſtowage; by trying to puzzle and perplex the ſearch. And allow me to call upon you in his behalf to decide, you whoſe good and fair opinions I know he wiſhes to deſerve, whether thoſe

ſentiments do not tend to exempt him from all ſuſpicion on that head. For till the point ſhall be fully ſettled between the Company and owners, as to what room ſhall be occupied by ſtores, and what by goods, endleſs altercations will ariſe between the parties, upon this ſubject of the ſtowage; nor can it ever be fairly adjuſted, but by an allotment of that ſpace, which ſhall be appropriated for the reception of goods; and by the Directors marking out, in conjunction with the owners, what ſpace ſhall be allotted for the ſtores of the ſhip, and for the water and proviſions for the crew.

The great object of this late publication ſeems to be deſigned to inſtigate the Proprietors to build their own ſhips. And the writer of that performance appears to be very ſevere upon one of the preſent Directors, on a ſurmiſe of his oppoſing the meaſure. Surmiſe it muſt be merely, as that Director has never publicly gone into the inveſtigation, or delivered any opinion on the ſubject.

It is upon the ſuppoſition of your building your own ſhips, that this writer has ſtated his eſtimate of the expences attending two ſhips of different ſizes, through ſix voyages for each ſhip. Your ſhips at preſent

ſent go but four voyages; however, he goes upon a ſuppoſition of their making two more, before they ſhall be conſidered as worn out.

The ſmall ſhip might perhaps be ſent to ſea from the ſtocks for 17,000 l. and perform her voyages for ſomething near that ſum upon an average for each voyage. But as to the idea that 80 hands will be ſufficient to navigate a ſhip of 600 tons burthen to and from the *Eaſt Indies*, therein I apprehend this writer to be much miſtaken; that number, or rather fewer men may be enough for ſhorter voyages, ſuch as to the *Sugar Iſlands*, *Virginia*, &c. on which voyages 18 or 20 different officers, beſides ſervants, can be diſpenſed with, all of whom are abſolutely neceſſary upon the long voyages: add to this, upon thoſe ſhorter voyages the maſts and yards are always reduced, and the ſhip in conſequence much lighter rigged.

The ſhip of 1100 tons burthen, if built of the proper dimenſions in every reſpect for that ſize, will not, I am afraid, perform her ſix voyages for ſeveral thouſand pounds more upon each voyage, than the average price contained in this writer's eſtimate, will amount to. Indeed, I believe the writer may be ſafely de-

fied

fied to produce any perſon experienced in the building, fitting, and ſtoring an *Eaſt Indiaman*, who can, from good authority, ſupport the calculation which he has given in his publication, for the expence of a ſhip of 1100 tons burthen, through ſix voyages to the *Eaſt Indies* and back. The keel of a ſhip of that tonnage ſhould be 128 or 129 feet; the beam 40½ feet; and the depth of the hold 17 feet ſix or ſeven inches, with the ſcantlings in proportion.

Experience is the ſureſt guide to oppoſe to erroneous eſtimates; therefore, as the calculation ſeems to have had the *Swediſh* ſhips in view, and as they are certainly the neareſt, and the moſt ſimilar to the ſtandard given in the late publication, it cannot be an unfair ſtep to draw a compariſon between that eſtimate, and the coſt of a *Swediſh* ſhip of about 1160 or 1170 tons, and which has been procured from undeniable authority.

The ſhips ſent from *Sweden* to *China* may be conſidered as the completeſt merchant ſhips in *Europe*. They certainly go ſix voyages; but then in the courſe of thoſe ſix voyages, they are almoſt rebuilt. At the end of every voyage they undergo very material repairs, ſuch as in the

docks upon the banks of the *Thames* would amount to a very great expence indeed.

Thoſe ſhips ſail conſtantly in one track, are navigated for a ſeries of years by the ſame men, the voyage, from the regularity of the ſeaſons, certain; the weather more favourable than moſt other voyages; and the cargoes the lighteſt, ſafeſt, and eaſieſt for ſtowage. The materials for conſtructing and fitting the *Swediſh* ſhips, ſuch as timber, maſts, hemp, tar, pitch, and iron, are all the natural produce of *Sweden*, or the adjacent countries. So that ſeveral of the articles muſt come cheaper than in *England*. The *Swediſh* ſhips carry from 150 to 165 men to navigate them, whoſe wages and proviſions do not amount to half the coſt the ſame number would come to in an *Engliſh* ſhip.

The following ſtatement will ſhew the coſt of a ſhip of 1160 or 1170 tons burthen, built in *Sweden*, through the courſe of ſix voyages from *Gottenburgh* to *China* and back.

The *Adolphus Frederick*, the ſhip of the largeſt dimenſions, coſt to ſea, including proviſions, premium for inſurance, &c.

	S.M.D.	Sil. Mint Dol	£.
		708,650, equal	29,527
Wages for 160 men, 22 months — —	70,000		
Proviſions for ditto, ditto ditto, at the rate of 6d. ſterling per day each man — — —	64,000		
Allowances in lieu of private trade — —	72,000		
Diſburſements at *Cadiz* — — —	15,000		
Canton Port charges, &c. — — —	95,000		
Cape and *St. Helena* homeward — —	2,500		
Dover charges for pilotage, &c. — —	2,500		
S.M.D.	321,000		
Amount of the ſame for ſix voyages comes to — —		1,926,000	
Inſurance for five voyages on 500,000 S.M.D. at 10 *per cent.* for each voyage — — — — — —		250,000	
Carpenters repairs, fitting and ſtores for five voyages — —		750,000	
Intereſt at five *per cent.* for 15 years on 350,00 S.M.D. being the eſtimated average in advance for each voyage at the commencement		262,500	
S.M.D.		3,897,150	
Wharfage, ſtorehouſes for the ſhip's ſtores, and unloading for ſix voyages — — — — — — —		216,000	
S.M.D.		4,113,150	
Deduct for ſale of the ſhip at the end of the ſixth voyage —		40,000	
S.M.D.		4,083,150, equal	£. 171,131

Exchange at 10 pence ſterling each S.M.D.

This ſtatement makes the average coſt of the ſhip through each voyage come to 680,525 S.M.D. or 28,355l. Now if to this ſum ſhall be added an allowance of 420l. only for the ſhort delivery and damages which the owners of the freighted ſhips are obliged to make good upon the outward and homeward bound cargoes, with 30 *per cent.* upon many articles.

The ſhip of the before mentioned burthen would then coſt, upon an average for each voyage 28,775l. for which the *Swediſh* Company would be to receive a cargo, clear from all deficiencies, to the amount of * 1250 tons, equal to 23l. 2s. per ton.

Now deducting from the above average price per voyage, amounting to the

* The *Adolphus Frederick* brought upon one voyage goods to the amount of —	Tons. 1,336
On another voyage — — —	1,233
And on another — — —	1,193
Making together — — Tons	3,762
Which upon an average for each voyage comes to — — — Tons	1,254

ſum

sum of — — — £. 28,775

100,000 S. M. D. on account of the indulgence in private trade, and for the measurement of the ship at *Canton*, not paid by the owners of the freight ships, and which amounts to about 4,165

And then to the remainder £. 24,610

if there shall be added the additional expence for * wages, † provisions, ‡ stores, and all the different § articles in repairing and fitting for each respective voyage; ‖ the

* Wages in *Sweden* for 160 men, for 22 months — — — — £. 2,916

† Provisions at 6d. per day for 160 men 22 months — — — — 2,666

£. 5,582

‡ The additional wages at 45 s. per month for 160 men, for 22 months — — £. 5,280

§ The provisions are set at 6d. per day, say only double in the *English* ship, for 160 men, will be — — — — 2,666

£. 7,946

‖ Cost of the masts, yards, sails, cordage, repairs of ship, and all other expences in the *Thames* more than at *Gottenburgh* at least — — — — — 7,000

£. 14,946

loading, unloading, docking, wharfage and ſtorehouſes, with the additional intereſt for the additional money in advance, which all theſe articles would amount to, more in the river of *Thames* than at *Gottenburgh*; when theſe circumſtances ſhall all be brought into the account, the charge of a ſhip of 1160 or 1170 tons, through ſix voyages, will be found nothing ſhort of * 40,000 l. (but will rather exceed it) upon the average for each voyage. Upon a ſhip of this burthen, after the uſual allowance was deducted for private trade, and the goods reduced to the Company's aſſortments, the amount of the cargo would as often be under as over the tonnage of the ſhip; but admitting the tonnage of the cargo to be 1200 tons, and the average coſt 40,000 l. the goods would then come home at 33 l. 6 s. 8d. per ton.

However if a ſhip of about this burthen, built in *England* upon a proportional conſtruction and ſcantling with the *Swe-*

* Average amount in *Sweden* for the expence of each voyage, ſimilar to freight ſhips	24,610
Additional expence, ſhip fitted from the *Thames* — — — —	15,000
	£. 39,610

diſh

diſh Eaſt India ſhips, was to be fitted from the *Thames*, and to go ſix voyages; the original coſt, with the charge of fitting, repairs, &c. through the ſeveral voyages, together with all incidental expences, would, I am inclined to think, ſwell the account higher than is here ſet down. For thoſe *Swediſh* ſhips have a great many of their timbers ſhifted through the courſe of the ſeveral voyages. The expence ſuch a renovation muſt entail upon bolted frames here in *England*, every builder will own would be very conſiderable.

The ſum of * 26,000 l. would not have been found ſufficient, I apprehend, to build a ſhip of 1100 tons burthen, even ſome years back, and ſend her to ſea manned, fitted, ſtored, and ſupplied with proviſions for a voyage to and from the *Eaſt Indies*. For ſome of the ſhips of the larger dimenſions now in the ſervice, not

* After premiſing the accounts are ſtated at the current prices uſually paid in times of peace; the writer's words are, *I ſhall, however, to avoid cavil, ſtate the firſt coſt and all expences relative to the outſet and diſburſe of a ſhip of* 1100 *tons, builder's meaſure, at* 26,000 l. *with* 140 *ſeamen to man her, at* 11. 6 s. *for each per month, for* 18 *months, with* 15 l. *per month for commander and mates.*

quite

quite 900 tons, built upon the banks of the *Thames* in time of peace, and victualled only for 108 or 110 men, have coſt to ſea near 24,000 l.

However there is a point more likely to gain credit with the uninformed, that reſpecting the aſſerted capacity of the Company's freighted ſhips for ſtowage of goods, ſo much beyond what has hitherto been brought home. For it has been affirmed, that a ſhip of 1100 tons could bring 1450 freight tons from *China* on the Company's account. This opinion has been brought forward under ſome apparent authority, as it has probably ariſen from a paper produced about two or three years ago, and ſaid to contain the particulars of a *Swediſh* cargo *; the paper was at that time conſidered of ſuch authenticity, as to be ſent into the freight office, in order to be brought into freight tons.

It was this aſſerted cargo which induced an inquiry to be made into the ſtate of the *Swediſh* ſhips ſent to *China*. And by means of the printed cargo of the goods brought upon the *Finland* to *Gottenburgh* in 1774; the paper above alluded to was

* The *Finland*, in 1774.

diſ-

diſcovered to contain a very erroneous ſtatement of the cargo. The error being to no leſs amount than 252 tons of bohea and 41 tons of green teas. Thus the *Finland*'s cargo had been made to conſiſt of 293 freight tons more than were ever laden *.

Some minds might be led to interpret ſuch a circumſtance, as done with a deſign to miſlead your judgment, and thereby ſtrengthen and encreaſe the notions already imbibed of the willful neglect of,

* *Swediſh* lb. of tea aſſerted to have laden on the *Finland* in 1774, by the paper given into the freight office — lb. 1,715,838
Amount laden by the printed cargo 1,372,673½

Error — — — *Swediſh* lb. 343,164½

And conſiſted of 303,547 *Swed.* lb. of bohea, equal to *Engl.* lb. — — 282,298¼
And 39,618 *Swed.* lb. of green, equal to *Engl.* lb. — — — — 36,844½

Making together *Engl.* lb. — — 319.143

Engl. lb.				Freight tons.
Bohea 282,298, make	—	—	—	252
Green 36,844, make	—	—	—	41
Freight tons	—	—	—	293

or

or inattention paid to, the ſtowage of your goods on board the freighted ſhips.

This writer, who has endeavoured to bring diſcredit on the Obſervations, muſt, in his firſt performance, have groſly miſtaken their meaning, for how could he have inſinuated elſe from any expreſſion contained in the Obſervations, that the aim was to condemn large ſhips at all events; ſo far otherwiſe, the Obſervations point out the preſent advantage ariſing from large ſhips going to *China*, in preference to ſhips of ſmaller dimenſions, wherein the advantage conſiſts, and to what amount? In ſhort the writer ſeems to have confounded the reprobating of the particular conſtruction of the preſent large ſhips into a total diſapprobation of the ſize. The whole that the Obſervations have ſaid on that head, is, that as the ſmaller ſhips would become of the moſt public benefit, if they could ever be built to bring the goods home on terms as reaſonable and advantageous for the Company, as the larger; that in ſuch caſe, in his opinion, they ſhould have the preference. And for this purpoſe the Obſervations urge, that the dimenſions and conſtructions of the hulls, and the rigging and equipment of the ſhips cannot be

too

too accurately conſidered, in order to ſee whether by that means the ſcantlings may not be reduced, and the ſails and rigging, and other materials, made lighter, and of courſe cheaper. The dimenſions of the preſent ſhips have been left at large in great meaſure; and various conſtructions have been planned, and different experiments have been tried in conſequence. Whereby that original principle is now departed from, which was adopted by the Company, in thoſe days when commerce was the ſole object of her attention. The ſize of ſhips may be encreaſed, yet the original principle of building ſtrictly adhered to. A merchant ſhip requires a flat floor, therefore ought not to be extended on the beam in the proportion given to a ſhip of war, and above her lower deck the merchant ſhip cannot be too ſnug, as the lighter and cloſer the upper works, the leſs a ſhip will ſtrain and open, and conſequently the cargo will be kept drier, and leſs expoſed to damage. For ſhips with too much weight aloft, and expanded in breadth, muſt ſtrain and open to a great degree in rowling through long voyages, all which may be greatly prevented by contracting the

upper works, and not ſtowing too much weight upon the decks.

The Obſervations exploded the preſent ſyſtem of building, becauſe the length of the keel and the depth of the hold, were not made proportionable to the extent of the beam; and to make up for theſe defects. The upper works have been enlarged and expanded very improperly; this meaſure the author of the Obſervations has conſidered, as a falſe principle for the conſtruction of a merchant ſhip.

It may reaſonably be concluded, the error of this ſyſtem is in ſome meaſure perceived; a ſtrong proof at leaſt, appears in ſupport of the conjecture, from the ſhip built upon the bottom of the *Royal Captain*, and now called the *Royal Admiral*; that ſhip having near ſix feet more keel, eight inches leſs beam, and four inches more depth in the hold, than the former ſhip, yet meaſures only 12 tons more. I know not, if the upper works of that ſhip have been drawn in more than thoſe of the former; but ſure I am, they ought to be very conſiderably in all the large ſhips conſtructed in future, as ſuch conſtruction contributes much to

ſtrengthen a ſhip, and make a good ſea boat of her.

This writer, in both his publications, ſeems to enforce the idea of taking away all indulgence in private trade homeward. But at the ſame time hints at an encreaſe in the outward indulgence, much too conſiderable ever to be admitted; becauſe, according to the propoſition he alludes to *, the uſual tonnage would be very inſufficient to anſwer the Company's demand, and provide for ſo great an addition to the private trade; eſpecially in time of war, when the crown has a large quantity of naval ſtores to ſend out. But at no period has the Company had ſo conſiderable a quantity of tonnage outward to ſpare as would be ſufficient to provide for the propoſed encreaſe in private trade.

If all privilege homeward was to be taken away, and 2000 l. paid in lieu thereof to each commander; the Company would then have 30 or 40,000 l. to pay upon 18 or 20 ſhips. For it is idle to ſuppoſe the Owners would pay any part of the homeward indulgence, without being reimburſed by ſome mode or other.

* See the Appendix to Sir *Richard Hotham*'s Candid State of *India* Affairs.

Beſides this amount, the further ſum of 15 or 20,000 l. levied in duties upon the private trade would all be loſt. Now the additional room gained by taking away all private trade homeward, amounting to 50 or 60 tons in each ſhip, when reckoned at half freight, the moſt it could be fairly ſet at, would not more than repay one third part of that expence * the Company muſt incur from the ſum to be granted in lieu of private trade homeward; and from the loſs in duties collected on the private trade.

In anſwer to all this, it will probably be ſaid, *The room taken up by the mere privilege is no very material point; but to ſecure for the uſe of the Company, the room ſo often filled with illicit trade, is the great object; and which at times has engroſſed large portions of the hold and gun-room; thence it will be urged, the benefit is to reſult to the Company from preventing ſuch deſtructive practices in future.*

* 18 ſhips private trade, ſay 1000 tons, at 16 l. per ton, equal — —	£. 16,000
To be paid in lieu of trade, 2000 l. a ſhip on 18 ſhips — — — —	36,000
Loſs by duties, ſay only — —	14,000
	£. 50,000

If

If this buſineſs had been inquired into, as impartially, and as thoroughly, as every concern of moment ought to be, before it is laid open to the public, it would have been diſcovered that the Company could receive no material injury, in reſpect of ſtowage from the goods laden for the purpoſe of ſmuggling. As it muſt readily be allowed by every perſon converſant in the goods brought from *India*, that the fine goods, the only aſſortments ever attempted to be ſmuggled from *Bengal* or *Madraſs*, take up but little room, ſtowing to a very conſiderable amount in ſuch a narrow compaſs, as not to make it in the leaſt neceſſary to encroach on the indulgence allowed for private trade on board each ſhip.

From *China* indeed the goods uſually ſmuggled take up more room, particularly the teas, but not room ſufficient by any means, to account for one eighth part of that difference between the utmoſt that any ſhips from *China* have brought hitherto; and what it has been aſſerted might be ſtowed.

For the private trade allowed to be brought from *China* amounts to 60 tons. And 400 quarter cheſts of tea do not meaſure more than 33 tons, and if any commander ſhould have acted in a manner ſo un-

unjuſtifiable, and ſo thoughtleſs and imprudent with reſpect to his own intereſt, as to have ſmuggled to that amount, or even one or two hundred cheſts more; ſtill he might lade a good deal of private trade to ſend to the India-Houſe, and not exceed his privilege more than 25 or 30 tons at moſt.

The Director who has been attacked with ſo much acrimony, and of whom this writer ſeems to entertain ſo unfavourable an opinion, is as far, I will venture to ſay, from aiming to miſlead, or from wiſhing to encourage illicit trade as himſelf; and I doubt not will prove as faithful, and perhaps as uſeful in the purſuit of your true intereſt. At leaſt I think he will never fall into ſuch egregious miſtakes as this Committee-man has done.

Smuggling, being contrary to the laws of our country, cannot with propriety be countenanced by its ſubjects; and being contrary to the eſtabliſhed rules of the Company, it is the duty of your Directors to prevent its being carried into effect, to the utmoſt of their power, in whatever relates to your concerns.

It is much to be wiſhed therefore that ſome reviſion might take place, reſpecting the indulgencies in private trade. And in ſuch caſe, where would be the impro-

priety

priety to allow the commander and officers of every ſhip, returning from either of the three preſidencies of Bengal, Madraſs, or Bombay, to pay into the Company's caſh for bills on the Company in England, to the amount of 11 or 12,000l. which would afford them much relief. The Directors might alſo be permitted, under the ſanction of a general Court, to remove in ſome degree thoſe reſtrictions, which forbid their marine ſervants to trade in certain ſtaples outward bound. And the privilege to the commanders and officers of the China ſhips in the article of tea, might, without any material injury, be encreaſed.

Theſe ſteps may certainly be taken, and no real detriment ariſe to the excluſive rights of the Company. For with reſpect to the outward inveſtment, however neceſſary it might be to forbid the commanders to deal in certain ſtaples, in thoſe days, when the trade to India was confined within a narrow compaſs; now that it is ſo amazingly encreaſed in England, and become diffuſed throughout moſt of the maritime ſtates in Europe, ſeveral of thoſe reſtrictions ceaſe to be of the ſame conſequence.

The Company in the outward inveſtments ſeldom exceed the amount required by

by Parliament to be annually exported. And the ſame ſtaples your ſervants are reſtricted from dealing in, and which are the produce of this country, may be purchaſed by foreigners; and by them too are often carried in large quantities to India. So that the markets would not be hurt by any indulgence you could conſiſtently give your ſervants in thoſe articles, they are at preſent forbid to trade in. But the advantage the commanders and officers would have from carrying their goods freight free, might contribute to drive the foreigners to deſiſt.

In their homeward inveſtments from *China*, the commander and officers have had no encreaſe to their privileges in the article of tea, now that the ſhips are become much larger, beyond what was allowed them when the ſhips were only 5 or 600 tons. The utmoſt increaſe the commanders and officers could in reaſon deſire, would not exceed 170 or 180 quarter cheſts to each ſhip; making the whole indulgence of teas to each ſhip, about 280 or 290 quarter cheſts. This would not produce a profit to them more than equal to the former gains on that article, when the indulgence was firſt ſettled. The certain loſs to the Company would not exceed 8 or 9000l. a year, for permitting each *China* and *Ben-*

coolen

coolen ſhip to bring home in private trade, to the above amount. And ſurely no Proprietor will heſitate to give the marine ſervants advantages, that ſhall equal their former emoluments; eſpecially whilſt thoſe advantages ſhall be provided at an eaſy rate, and upon terms the leaſt burthenſome to the Company, as the following ſtatement will ſhew.

A ſtatement of the additional expence that would ariſe to the Company from encreaſing the privilege in tea to the commanders and officers; 180 or 190 quarter cheſts to each ſhip beyond the preſent allowance.

				£.	s.	d.
100 Cheſts of hyſon tea, containing 7,000 lb. at 9s. per lb.				3,150	0	0
9s. is the average price of the Company's hyſons, taken for three years.	Deduct 2 *per cent.* for waſtage			60	10	0
				3,090	0	0
	Diſcount at 6½ *per cent.* allowed			200	17	0
			£.	2,889	3	0
To cuſtoms at 23 l. 18 s. 8 d. *per cent.* on 3,150 l.	—	—		755	8	0
Two *per cent.* warehouſe room on 3,090 l.	—	—	—	61	16	0
Prime coſt of the goods in *China* at 60 taels per pecul freight merchandize and factory charges included thereon, 52½ pecul, equal 3,146 tael, which at 3 tael to the lb. ſterling, gives	—			1,048	13	0
Loſs ariſing from the exchange, ſuppoſing the 3,146 raiſed by bills of exchange, drawn at 5s. 3d.	—	—	—	97	8	0
Commiſſion to the ſupercargoes on 2,134 l. at 5 *per cent.*				106	14	0
				2,069	19	0
Net gain eſtimated to ariſe from the ſale of 100 cheſts of hyſon tea, belonging to the Company	—	—	—	—	—	—
				819	14	0
Duties paid on private trade tea, and which become a clear gain to the Company.						
The 5 *per cent.* duty on 100 cheſts of tea valued as above at 3,090 l. amounts to	—	—	—	154	10	0
10 *per cent.* indulgence on 2672 l. 10 s.	—	—	—	267	4	10
				421	14	10
What the Company gains more by the 100 cheſts, if their own, than from the duties levied on 100 cheſts in private trade	—	—	—	£.	397	9 2

[114]

Hence the additional expence to the Company, for an encreaſe of 190 cheſts of tea to each ſhip, reckoning 10 or 11, including the *Bencoolen* ſhips, would amount to 8,500 l. or near that ſum.

The room taken up in the propoſed encreaſe in teas beyond the preſent indulgence, can be no material object, as the number of tons already allowed for private trade, will amply provide for it. After ſome ſuch ſteps as are here propoſed ſhall have been taken, whoever was detected in ſmuggling, unleſs within ſome inconſiderable ſpecified amount, to be perſued to juſtice, and ſeverely puniſhed, under the expreſs letter of a bye-law, which no compromiſe, no favour, or indulgence, no powerful intereſt ſhould be able to diſpenſe with. The evil, if this was to be done, would ſoon abate, and many diſagreeable circumſtances be removed.

As to the idea of your building your own ſhips; that is a ſubject which requires your moſt ſerious conſideration. It certainly behoves the Directors to be well aſſured of the conſequences, before they ſhall either approve or condemn the meaſure.

At preſent a bye-law deprives them of the power to appropriate any part of the money in your treaſury, for the purpoſe of building ſhips, to bring home the goods or merchandize from *India*. Thus ſituated, it would ſurely ill become your Directors in particular, whoſe truſt and means of information add to their reſponſibility, to urge forward, in too precipitate a manner, a buſineſs of ſuch importance; without cautiouſly examining into the motives which induced your predeceſſors, to lay ſo effectual a bar to prevent the Directors from building or buying ſhips on your account, to carry on the trade to and from *India*. For it is only by well weighing and conſidering the motives for laying any ſuch reſtraint, preparatory to the repeal of it, that you the Proprietors can be ſatisfied, whether the like evils, the law was firſt eſtabliſhed to correct, ſhall not ariſe again in future. The expence which muſt be incurred, from your undertaking the management and detail of ſuch a branch of buſineſs, ought to be fully and clearly inveſtigated before you embark, bringing into the account every contingent circumſtance; ſtating what the evident ſavings, if any, would amount to,

and

and what new bye-laws may become neceſſary, upon ſo great a change and alteration in the ſyſtem. If after all theſe points ſhall have been thoroughly diſcuſſed, it ſhall appear moſt for your advantage to build your own ſhips; the meaſure ſhould by all means be adopted, and have your hearty concurrence to carry it effectually into execution. All that every impartial perſon can wiſh or deſire, is, that you may not determine too haſtily on a point of ſuch conſequence to your intereſts, in many reſpects.

If by any method to be diſcovered, the ſhips can be conſtructed and fitted cheaper, than they are at preſent, the goods may undoubtedly be brought cheaper home; and if any ſuch meaſures ſhould be found practicable, the Directors, with your aſſiſtance, only can carry them into execution, whether the ſhips ſhall be your own, or hired upon freight. For if the ſhips are not your own, but are let to you by individuals; ſtill the owner of every ſhip muſt ſubmit to whatever inſpection, regulations, and controul, the Directors ſhall eſtabliſh, or withdraw his tender. For if the terms are equitable and fair, the owners muſt, nay will readily, agree to them; beſides, in that caſe, if any ſhould reject your

terms, others will be eaſily found to ſupply their places. As to what is equitable and fair for you to give, and for the owners to accept, that may ſoon be aſcertained to a ſufficient exactneſs; by a cool deliberate diſcuſſion between the Directors, and a few of the moſt experienced owners. And at the ſame time the room in the ſhip to be occupied by goods, and what ſhall be reſerved for ſtores and proviſions, might be ſettled and adjuſted.

The owner has the appointment of the commander, under the Directors approval, and at preſent has alſo the power of arbitrary diſmiſſion. The owner formerly had no more than the original appointment; for after the commander was approved by the court of Directors, the court only had the power to remove him from his command. A power the Directors muſt have relinquiſhed of their own accord, for it could not be forced from them. For what reaſon it was given up is unknown. It could not be done to anſwer any uſeful purpoſe to the Company. The Commander thereby was taught to look no longer up to the Company for protection. Whereas, every perſon employed in your ſervice, ought to look only up to you, or to your delegates for reward or ſupport.

For

For when the Directors, reſerving to themſelves only the power to puniſh, gave up that right of protection ſo neceſſary to ſpur men on to their duty with alacrity and zeal; they left their marine ſervants totally uncertain to whom to look up to, for ſupport in future. The commanders tenure by that means became very inſecure; for property ſhifting hands, the new owner was bound by no tie either of juſtice or honour to continue the former commander, if he wiſhed to prefer any friend of his own, equally qualified. In ſhort, the Directors by relinquiſhing that right moſt effectually contributed to throw the ſhipping ſyſtem into anarchy and confuſion.

The idea that the Company ſhall be able to load more upon their own, than on the freight ſhips, ſeems to be very difficult to make appear. For, in either caſe, the completion of the loading to the moſt advantage, muſt depend upon the conduct of the commander, and that of the inſpecting officers under the Company, both at home and abroad; and on the wiſdom likewiſe of the regulations the Directors ſhall eſtabliſh, for that purpoſe, with the neceſſary ſteps to enforce them.

May not the ſame motives operate to overlook miſconduct in the Company's own ſhips, as can at any time influence in favour of thoſe hired upon freight? Bye-laws and other reſtraints may be equally ordained for the government of, and carried into execution, againſt any tranſgreſſions in, the freight ſhips, as the Company's own ſhips, and are as neceſſary for the general benefit in one ſituation, as in the other. Why any of thoſe reſtraints or controuls which formerly ſubſiſted, have been removed, or why the original principles of the old charter-party, have been cut up by the roots, and altered for the worſe, let thoſe who introduced the innovations explain. Certain it is, the owners could not effect the alterations of themſelves.

It may with truth be ſaid, that the general conduct of the gentlemen who at preſent preſide over the Company's affairs, has hitherto been as free from blemiſh, as can be expected in a public body. Nevertheleſs, the period may come, when power may ſhift hands, and ſome unprincipled time-ſerving man may get the lead, and through the influence of party, manage that direction, and bend it to his own purpoſes.

If

If this ſhould ever happen, may there not be room to apprehend, that in caſe the Company ſhould build the ſhips, the commands might ſometimes be bargained for as eaſily as they may at preſent by individuals, who have no voice in your concerns; and if ever it ſhould happen for a Director to traffick in commands, he would find himſelf, I am afraid, under the neceſſity to connive at illicit practices, and to extricate his purchaſer from every difficulty and embarraſſment, whatever injury might be done to your intereſt, from the commander's miſconduct. If that practice cannot be totally removed, it might perhaps by wiſe and wholeſome regulations be reduced; and if it is to prevail in any degree, the Director ought to be the laſt perſon who ſhould have it in his power to barter a command; becauſe it can never be attended with the ſame pernicious conſequences in any other hands.

Every man who ſubmits his opinions to the public, leaves them open to the comments of all who chuſe to animadvert on them. As the Obſervations have been very harſhly and ungenerouſly commented upon, the author muſt feel ſome conſolation, to find it has been done ſo injudiciouſly. For I think the writer of the

Remarks will find moſt of his *eſtimates have fallen to the ground.*

Your ſhipping, for ſeveral years paſt, has been in a very fluctuating and unſettled ſtate; various haſty opinions were formed upon the ſubject, and which have ſince been maintained with a degree of obſtinacy, as ſeldom fails to produce heat and animoſity.

Therefore, before I finally take leave of this ſubject, and which I now intend to do. I cannot avoid expreſſing my wiſhes that ſome ſteps may be taken towards rectifying thoſe errors crept into the ſhipping department. And if the object of all this buſtle, all this apparent zeal for your intereſt, is to correct thoſe abuſes ſo frequently complained of; ſurely ſome reviſion will ſhortly take place, whether you ſhall hence forward build your own ſhips, or continue to hire thoſe employed in your ſervice.

FINIS.